EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY REQUESTING THE FUNDING OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 28, 1973, the South Carolina General Assembly passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress to recommend and appropriate adequate funds to continue the implementation of the Library Services and Construction Act.

On behalf of the junior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and myself, I bring to the attention of the Senate this concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, I am advised that the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Labor and HEW will be holding hearings on this matter. I am sure the Senate will give careful consideration to the report of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HOLLINGS and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

To memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to recommend and appropriate adequate funds to continue the effective implementation of the Library Services and Construction Act

Whereas, the General Assembly of South Carolina is well aware of the necessity for both the President and the Congress to exercise caution and restraint in the expenditure of federal tax revenues, it being similarly situated with regard to the expenditure of State funds; and

Whereas, the General Assembly, none the less, believes that in the determination of priorities in the use of public revenues the basic needs of the people and the success of existing programs must be given serious consideration and should indeed be the determining factors in the arrangement of those priorities; and

Whereas, for many years the Library Services and Construction Act enacted by the Congress has resulted in remarkable improvements and expansion in library systems throughout the State, provided scholarships which increased the number of persons trained in library science, made library facilities available to millions of additional persons particularly those who were culturally and economically disadvantaged, brought assistance and special training to the functionally illiterate and generally has raised the quality of the libraries everywhere; and

Whereas, these contributions to our society have paid and will continue to pay dividends in the happiness and productiveness of our citizens far in excess of the cost of the program; and

Whereas, the Library Services and Construction Act could by no stretch of the imagination be termed one of those programs which has failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was created. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the President and Congress of the United States be and hereby are memorialized to recommend and appropriate adequate funds to continue the effective implementation of the Library Services and Construction Act and thereby prevent the lights being turned out in libraries throughout the land.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate and each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C.

THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the grave constitutional issues of our time is that relating to newsmen and newswomen and their confidential news sources. Accordingly, I have introduced H.R. 3725, and on March 1 I testified on behalf of this legislation before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. Because of the great public controversy stirred by this issue, I believe it is appropriate that Members of the House be advised of the statement I read to that distinguished panel. The statement follows:

A STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES V. STANTON ON H.R. 3725, A BILL TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

Members of the Subcommittee:

I am greatly honored to appear before you today, and to have this distinguished panel of the Judiciary Committee consider my legislation on this highly important topic. As the title says, H.R. 3725 is intended "to protect the public's right to know."

The bill is very brief. It is limited to two sentences. At the outset it says: "No person shall be required by any Federal Court, grand jury, or agency, or by the Congress, to reveal any information, including the source of any information, obtained in the course of that person's involvement in the obtaining of news for broadcast, or written or pictorial dissemination to the public."

It concludes with this second sentence: "As used in this Act, the term 'person' includes any corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, or joint stock company, as well as any individual."

You will note, of course, that this bill makes no exceptions. It is completely devoid of any qualifying language. If enacted, it would *absolutely* protect newsmen and newswomen against any attempt by governmental authorities to force them to reveal their sources of information, either directly or indirectly.

The protection it affords to journalists, however, is incidental. Our only concern here is not to keep journalists out of jail, or to shield them from subpoenas. We are concerned with a matter much more basic, going to the very heart of public policy in a democracy. That concern is protecting the *public* interest by assuring a free flow of information.

Now, it always sounds grandiose and perhaps somewhat self-serving when a Congressman speaks of "the public interest". Opponents of this legislation in the Nixon Administration would probably say I am using that phrase as a cover for protecting what really amounts to a *special* interest—namely, the news media.

I would make two points in reply. First, that the most direct route to "the public interest" is often indicated by the direction that a newsman happens to be pointing his pencil. Second, however—and, I submit, more important—is the fact that inherent in my legislation is a real solicitude not merely for newsmen but *also* for those persons who become their confidential news sources.

It is *they* who need protection perhaps more than journalists. For if the identity of the informant is forced into the open, he or she could become the target of a whole range of retaliatory actions. They would become so vulnerable that they would hesitate, to say the least, before imparting any information to a newsman, no matter how important it might be for the public to know the facts involved. Therefore, it is essential, if we want to encourage a free flow of information to the public, to enact legislation that protects not merely the conduit but also the *source* of such information.

Moreover, it is important that the source have no doubt that he is, in fact, protected. This is why a bill couched in absolute terms, as mine is—as the Bill of Rights is—is vital. If we were to enact a law saying that news sources are shielded except under certain circumstances—a law qualified by a list of "howevers"—then the source could have no assurance that his anonymity would be preserved. He would have the burden of trying to figure out beforehand whether he could, or could not, trust the law should he choose to let the public in on official secrets that really ought not to be secrets. His tendency then would be to play it safe—to adopt a personal policy which, in effect, would boil down to this: "When in doubt (which could be most of the time), keep quiet. Perhaps the people might find out some other way."

Under H.R. 3725, though, the source would *know* that the journalist he is dealing with could not be compelled to reveal his identity. His only problems, then, would be (a) whether he feels he could trust the journalist to fall back on this law, if that becomes necessary, and (b) whether he feels that he can indeed, in good conscience, violate the confidence of his superiors in the agency where he became privy to the classified information.

This latter consideration has its own implications in terms of good public policy but these, I submit, while indeed important, fall outside the purview of the issue concerning us here. In this connection, though, I think we ought to be cognizant of a basic distinction between the newsman and the news source. While the news source (if he is a public official) is an agent of the State, properly subject to disciplinary sanctions (no matter how high his motives) when he leaks information and gets caught doing it, the newsman himself is *not* an agent of the state. To force him into the role of state's agent, under threat of imprisonment, is to tamper with and abridge freedom of the press. Worse yet, it would create substantial doubts in the mind of the public that the press is, in fact, free—a neutral force interposing itself between the people and their government, in order to help the people exercise those rights that are reserved to them under our Constitution.

With the foregoing constituting the rationale, as I see it, for a statute conferring absolute immunity, I would like to call your attention more specifically to the scope and the phrasing of H.R. 3725.

As is evident, this bill would extend immunity to newsmen only in those cases where the Federal Government has jurisdiction. While I would be very pleased if this Subcommittee were to approve a bill conferring the same immunity with respect to State and local government, I suspect that Congress lacks authority to legislate in this area for States and their subdivisions.

The phrase "no person" applies to *any* person in the United States. In other words, the bill is not restricted in its coverage to professional newsmen or authors only. I don't think we can come up with a suitable definition of what is a professional newsman. But even if we could, I don't think we should limit the protection. A pamphleteer or the avocational publisher of a small newsletter, which he might distribute even free of charge, potentially has the capability of developing confidential sources of information—and information disseminated by him might have as high a degree of validity as the contents of our daily newspapers or better known magazines.

The "no person" formulation also affords protection to *former* newsmen who might be otherwise employed at the time an official inquiry is launched. Again, I think we must keep in mind the fact that we want to assure persons with information to impart that they need not fear forced betrayal by the newsman receiving the data. Informants naturally would feel inhibited if they could be certain of protection only on a temporary basis—only during the time that their contact remains employed by a given news organization.

"Any information" refers, of course, to notes and other materials in the possession of a writer or broadcaster which were not published or broadcast. Were a newsman forced by a subpoena to produce this background data, he might indirectly lead his inquisitors to the confidential source of information, since in many cases inferences could be drawn by investigators examining the material.

Section 2 further defines the term "person" and makes it clear that the word includes corporations and other business entities. I feel this is needed because organizations employing newsmen often have physical possession of his notes and other materials, and we ought to have a statute protecting them, too, against forced disclosure.

Thank you very much for your attention. I think I have covered now the salient points of H.R. 3725, and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

HORACE "BUCK" ALEXANDER AND WADE F. HURSEY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently Horace "Buck" Alexander and Wade F. Hursey retired from the Frederick Agriculture Society. Both men served for 17 years, Alexander as treasurer and financial clerk of the Great Frederick Fair and Hursey as secretary and chief clerk.

During their service the Fair has more than doubled in exhibits and patrons with nearly 100,000 people attending each year. The exhibits have changed in style through the specialized techniques shown in arts-crafts classes and each class has seen an improvement in quality of exhibits with more professionalism being shown.

Both men will be missed at the Fair but their imprint on the growth and success of the community will never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD E. ERNEST

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a San Pedro man is once again demonstrating the kind of leadership which has made the community of San Pedro admired throughout Greater Los Angeles.

That man is Los Angeles Fire Battalion Chief Richard E. Ernest.

Chief Ernest has originated an innovative, successful citywide juvenile counseling program.

The fireman counselor program arranges for firemen to counsel boys from 9 to 15 years of age who have been apprehended for law violations.

Over one-third of the firefighting force—about 1,200 persons—have volunteered to work as counselors. The goal of the counselors is to provide the boys with individualized attention, guidance, and companionship.

After a 3-year harbor area pilot project and a 9-month citywide test period, the Los Angeles Police Department has decided that the program is valuable enough to be expanded to all city fire and police stations.

And the program evolved because of the idea of one man—Chief Ernest.

Chief Ernest realized how valuable the program could be to Los Angeles while teaching in the School of Public Administration at the University of Southern California.

In 1968, after much discussion and planning, the program was launched with the help of USC's Delinquency Control Institute and the county juvenile court. Chief Engineer Raymond M. Hill of the city fire department was very active in organizing the program along with Chief Ernest.

After evaluating the pilot project as a success, Dick worked to develop a permanent program with the Los Angeles Police Department.

The spirit of Chief Ernest and the 1,200 volunteers which spurs them to devote so much of their time and energy so unselfishly to helping Los Angeles' youth gives them a very special distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will join with me to thank Chief Ernest and all the other dedicated persons who have created such a worthwhile program.

IN MEMORY OF LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the dean of the House, for taking this special order to allow us to pay our respects to the late President Johnson.

Lyndon Johnson's record of service to the people of this country is unmatched. His years in the Congress were marked by a compassion for the common people of the Nation and by his exceptional skills as a legislator. Having risen to the leadership of the Senate and having sought his party's nomination for the Presidency, Lyndon Johnson accepted the vice-presidential nomination. He served brilliantly in that office and was extraordinarily well prepared for the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency.

As President, he directed his attention and all of the powers of his office for the cause of economic and social justice. It is not necessary to recount the major innovations in domestic programs which were created under his leadership. For the first time in our history, we had a President who put the needs of minority, poor and disadvantaged people ahead of all other national priorities. His commitment to economic and social justice never flagged, and he used all of his talents as a leader to mobilize the Nation to build his visionary Great Society.

President Johnson understood, perhaps better than any other white political leader, the needs of black Americans. He listened to black leaders and to black people, and he dedicated himself to their cause.

Of all of his accomplishments, he was proudest of his civil rights legislation. With his passing we have lost a powerful ally, but more important we have lost a dear friend.

His memory will endure but it is up to us to build upon the programs he created. He recognized that his task was not finished. In his memory, we can do no less than our very best to bring about the economic and social justice for which he labored.

"MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM" BY SHARON ANN BLOCK

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in it, competing for the five national scholarships which were awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom."

The winning speech from New Mexico was written by Sharon Ann Block, 1502 East Rankin Avenue, Tucumcari, N. Mex. I believe we can all be proud of Sharon and her accomplishment; if we had more young citizens like her, many of the problems facing our Nation today would vanish.

I insert for the RECORD Sharon's speech as we can all learn from her words:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

We have it—Let's not lose it. Our nation has had freedom for almost 200 years now. Does this mean that it is here to stay? In 200 years, we have left bondage, and through faith and courage, have reached abundance. Now we must not let selfishness, complacency, and apathy move us backwards to dependence, and from dependence again to the chains of bondage.

Freedom was a gift that came with birth for you and me. So I will challenge all threats to this freedom in order that the next generation may inherit the same privilege.

Then I must be one who can find time for progress. I must find time to better my community. I can't leave it up to George, because I like progress. I like good schools, fine churches, modern hospitals, honest government, happy citizens and peaceful nations; therefore, I will accept my responsibility to freedom by being a community booster—the ambassador of good will. I must be a first-class citizen, a friend to education, and a helper of the handicapped. I will be a United Fund leader, a church goer, and a voter who has studied all the issues.

Our veterans have sacrificed their fortunes and their lives for my freedom. I, therefore, believe it is my privilege and my duty to love my country; support its constitution; obey its laws; respect its flag; and defend it against all enemies.

My country offers freedom as no land before has ever done. Freedom to live without fear. Freedom to speak, to argue, to criticize, and the right to dissent—but not to the point of destroying private property or human lives. Because, I want to keep these freedoms, I must have the courage to say "yes" and to say "no".

I cannot build the schools or hew the logs for the churches, but I can live by the code of this great land. In our churches, everyone worships God in his own way. Each one believing and praying as he must—yet all joining in that universal prayer that cries out to be free. Our churches can be crippled by bombs, blackened by fires, or threatened by riots, but we must never let the strong beams of spirit crumble. We must remember the cost to others for this freedom to worship as we please.

Must I be a missionary, or a politician to fulfill my responsibility to freedom? No, the little housewife can be the Sunday school teacher, the PTA chairman, or the salesman behind many steps of progress. She is America in a gingham dress. She is Democracy in a pair of blue jeans. She is freedom in a checkered apron.

Some would have us believe we have failed the great American dream. Mobs stone our embassies and dissenters make mockery of our freedom. But I have young hope in my heart. I believe what Dwight Eisenhower said: "There is nothing wrong with America that the faith, love of freedom, intelligence and energy of her citizens cannot cure." In 200 years we have cleared a wilderness, have become the grainery of the world, and the arsenal of freedom.

A million and more of my countrymen have died for this freedom. My ancestors gave their blood on the green at Lexington; on the snow at Valley Forge; on the walls of Ft. Sumter; on the fields at Gettysburg; on the beachhead of Normandy and the sands of Okinawa; and now in the rice paddies of Viet Nam.

So—I can be: Proud of my American past, alert to my American present, and confident in my American future.

I will have: Courage, patriotism and good citizenship.

But most of all—I will remember the price paid for my freedom.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my colleagues daily of the plight of our prisoners of war. Now, for most of us, the war is over. Yet despite the cease-fire agreement's provisions for the release of all prisoners, fewer than 600 of the more than 1,900 men who were lost while on active duty in Southeast Asia have been identified by the enemy as alive and captive. The remaining 1,220 men are still missing in action.

A child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife wonders: "Is my husband alive or dead?" How long?

Until those men are accounted for, their families will continue to undergo the special suffering reserved for the relatives of those who simply disappear without a trace, the living lost, the dead with graves unmarked. For their families, peace brings no respite from frustration, anxiety, and uncertainty. Some can look forward to a whole lifetime shadowed by grief.

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and their families, we can at least pay that minimum. Until I am satisfied, therefore, that we are meeting our obligation, I will continue to ask, "How long?"

THE 61ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE GIRL SCOUTS

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, during the week of March 11 through March 17 the Girl Scouts of the United States of America will celebrate their 61st anniversary and it is again a distinct pleasure for me to take this opportunity to congratulate this wonderful organization whose members are thoroughly dedicated and committed to the fulfillment of one of its most important doctrines; namely, that what you do is likely to be more important than what you say.

When Girl Scouting came to America 61 years ago, certainly an unprecedented long-range plan for the American girl was inaugurated and all down through the years we have witnessed the splendid contributions brought about by the emphasis of the organization on family, civic and worldwide responsibility as well as respect for God as evidenced by the young girls and adult leaders who are truly committed to this program.

As we all know, the stated purpose of the Girl Scouts of America is to inspire girls with the highest ideals of character, conduct, patriotism and service and in general to simply make life better for everyone thereby developing into happy and resourceful citizens themselves. Indeed, in my opinion, Girl Scouting clearly exemplifies that organized youth, through involvement with the handicapped, the aged, the ill and hospitalized, and the economically deprived, can be and often are, a vital force in establishing the principles and goals that are so much a part of our American heritage.

Here at home Scouting is a challenge filled with a host of advantages and opportunities. What an impressive picture the Girl Scouts organization manifests through worthwhile activities such as caring for individuals with special needs; assistance to those who are physically and mentally handicapped and providing a wide variety of services to the elderly who in turn use their skills to enrich the lives of the Girl Scouts. In addition, Girl Scouting has reached beyond the borders of the United States where over 75 countries reap the benefits of their high ideals and contributions.

The organization's international program allows for exchange of young girls all over the world whereby participants learn from each other and exchange ideas, heritages and cultures. By exposure to different customs and ways of living, these girls are provided with a mutual understanding and appreciation for people and nations unlike their own.

The Girl Scouts have made tremendous strides in enriching their program by greater participation of minority and disadvantaged girls. This is very significant when you consider the fact that more than 3.9 million members, aged 7 through 17, together with adult leaders in over 160,000 troops participate in Scouting in the United States today. Furthermore, I am justifiably proud and gratified to know that a tremendous response has been made by the girls in my home State of Kentucky where Scouting membership exceeds 40,000 and serves one out of every 11 girls in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this is the time for us to turn our attention to the nearly 4 million Girl Scouts who possess an important voice among America's youth and are striving to make each tomorrow a better day because of their sincere concern for their fellow man and their country. As they prepare to commemorate their national week of celebration, I want to extend to each and every member of the Girl Scouts in Kentucky and elsewhere my congratulations and best wishes for continued success in the future.

FLORENCE ROBINSON, POSTMASTER, BALDWIN, N.Y.

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted an article which appeared in the Baldwin, N.Y. Courier on February 23, 1973, with regard to the newly appointed postmaster at Baldwin, Mrs. Florence Robinson, who was formerly Postmaster at Lawrence, N.Y., had been serving as officer in charge of the Baldwin Post Office since January 1972.

Postmaster General Klassen recently noted that he appointed 1,161 women postmasters in 1972, and that nearly half of the Postmasters appointed since he took office have been women. All were chosen under the merit system, and in all cases primary consideration was given to qualified employees from within the Postal Service. I applaud Postmaster General Klassen's efforts to make equal employment opportunity for both sexes a reality.

I am enclosing the text of the Baldwin Courier article for the benefit of my colleagues, and I want to congratulate Mrs. Robinson on her well-deserved appointment.

The article follows:

POSTMASTER STATUS RETURNS TO BALDWIN POST OFFICE

(By S. Nick Napoli)

The Baldwin Post Office, without a postmaster since Alfred Cook resigned because of ill health in September 1970, except for three months in 1971-72, has again been assigned a postmaster. Mrs. Florence Robinson, officer-in-charge of the Baldwin office since January 1972 when she was transferred here from Lawrence, was appointed a postmaster this past Saturday. The appointment makes the Baldwin office the largest in Nassau County headed by a woman.

The postmaster office was lost to Baldwin after Cook resigned and Ward Samuelson was appointed as officer-in-charge in September 1970; it regained the office on October 30 of the following year with Samuelson's promotion, then lost it again when the postal service moved Samuelson to Rockville Centre and Mrs. Robinson from Lawrence to Baldwin. It was in change in titles for Mrs. Robinson who was postmaster of the Lawrence office to officer-in-charge in Baldwin but the move put her in line for more money and an opportunity for promotion in a larger office.

A career postal employee now—she joined the postal service nine years ago—she has had a varied career since her graduation from Lawrence High School. After graduation she became secretary to the Charlie Spivack Band in charge of the organization's New York office where she handled payroll, kept track of the band's club dates, managed to have men and instruments at the same places at the same times and listened to Charlie Spivack records.

In 1950 she retired from the Spivack organization to raise a family—Beth, now 22, a secretary for a Hempstead firm; Ilene, 19, a pre-law student attending the University of Strasbourg, France—then re-entered the business world five years later as a medical secretary.

Appointed Acting Postmaster of the Lawrence Post Office in 1963, she was nominated for the postmastership two years later. Congress confirmed the appointment in 1965. Last year she was named Officer-in-Charge of the Baldwin office.

The first woman to have charge of the local post office, the appointment was looked on by mailmen questioningly. While the authority she wields must be unquestioned by postal service rules, most postmen accept her for her ability, some even express admiration, one said, succinctly, "You know, at first a woman boss, well, you know—but she's really a good guy to work for."

As head of one of Baldwin's biggest businesses—the Baldwin Post Office grossed $750,000 in fiscal '71-72, its annual budget is about $1,800,000—Mrs. Robinson manages to make time for activities in postal service organizations. A former president of the Nassau County Postmasters Association, she was registrar ('69-70) and general chairman of the Postal Services Management Institute ('71), state director of the New York State Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, and at present is publicity chairman of the national organization. In May 1971 she was awarded the Postal Service Superior Accomplishment Award.

PRESIDENT NIXON ATTACKS THE POOR

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, during this era of Nixonism, the fundamental guarantees of the Constitution to defend the rights of minorities against capricious infringement by the majority have largely gone out of the window.

The minority of which I speak in this instance is not simply a racial or ethnic minority, but the poor of our Nation's cities, such as those of the New York City district I represent.

The following editorial from the March 7 Washington Post gives some further indication of how this administration has become so enraptured by its own brand of "pull yourself up by your bootstraps" philosophy that it is totally insensitive to the needs of the portion of our population that has no boots on which to pull.

POVERTY WITH HONOR

President Nixon seems to be applying to the cities the strategy that Senator Aiken recommended years ago for Vietnam: He is declaring victory and withdrawing his troops. It can only be a matter of time before the President declares that he has achieved—what? Poverty with honor? "The hour of crisis has passed," Mr. Nixon proclaimed last weekend. "The ship of state is back on an even keel, and we can put behind us the fear of capsizing." In fact, this suggests that the administration's urban mission over the past four years was primarily to quiet the cities and put down the poor. It is a curious approach, heralding a retreat which is neither warranted nor wise.

Mr. Nixon's assessment of the state of the cities indicates that a few items might have been left out of his daily news summaries recently. "City governments are no longer on the verge of financial catastrophe," he stated. But there is Detroit, where the public schools are fast running out of funds. There is Philadelphia, where the school system has barely avoided collapse. There is Newark on the edge of bankruptcy. There is Gary, Indiana, where—according to a sobering analysis by Godfrey Hodgson and George Crile in Sunday's Outlook section—the white community which dominates the local economy is pulling out, leaving a largely black, poor population unable to cope. There is the massive concentration of physical decay and social devastation in New York's South Bronx, surveyed recently in the New York Times. There is the fear and desolation in the high-est-crime blocks of Washington along 14th Street, which John Saar described in this newspaper on Sunday.

When Mr. Nixon's claims of progress are measured against these realities, the gains don't disappear—but they certainly shrink. The President emphasized, for instance, that crime is dropping "in more than half of our major cities." To the extent that crime statistics relate to actual crime, any reduction is an accomplishment. But reported crime is still rising, though slowly, in the suburbs, and violence and fear still permeate too many urban neighborhoods. Similarly, the urban air may be getting cleaner, as Mr. Nixon announced, but in more than two dozen cities it is still so unhealthy that traffic controls will have to be imposed to meet the 1975 air quality standards. And to say that a poor child in a rat-ridden ghetto might be breathing slightly more easily these days is not to say that child has any better prospects for a decent home, a solid education, a productive job or a healthy life. To say that a working-class family in an aging neighborhood might be slightly less afraid is not to say that family has been relieved of its heavy tax burdens or its sense of insecurity.

The situation in the cities is nowhere near as rosy as the President maintains. By the same token, federal programs for the cities, in the aggregate, have not been ruinous, as he pretends. Some of those programs were hastily conceived, many were under-funded, and most have come due for review. But his complaint about "high-cost, no-result boondoggling" is wide of the mark. Indeed, most cities could not have achieved even limited gains since the "hour of crisis" unless some federal assistance had been timely and well-targeted.

It is worth recalling that federal intervention in the cities, as in other areas of national need, has had two aims: to provide resources which state and local governments lacked, and to focus public effort on serious problems which communities were not equipped or inclined to take on by themselves.

Mr. Nixon used to recognize this. The heart of his welfare reform program, now abandoned, was the national assumption of responsibility for the problem of poverty. Back in the early days of his first term, there were even a few attempts to shape an enlightened urban strategy, one which recognized that the underlying social and economic woes of central cities often require regional solutions.

But those constructive efforts have now been junked, along with everything else. Mr. Nixon seems to believe, despite all the evidence to the contrary, that urban governments have been so enhanced, and urban problems somehow so reduced, that all the cities need from Washington is money—and less of that than before. It comes down to a prescription for self-reliance coupled with the elimination of those programs that could help people achieve it.

NEXT-DAY DELIVERY OF MAIL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the problems plaguing the present organizational and budgetary structure of the Postal Service, have caused a very real crisis in this most essential public service.

With 40,000 job vacancies waiting to be filled, a totally inflexible budgetary structure, most air-transported mail being relegated to a "space available" status, and stockpiles of mail accumulating at State distribution centers, it is time for Congress to reaffirm timely service as the goal of the postal system.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill which establishes specific standards of service for the Postal Service, and requires that Congress make the additional appropriations necessary to implement these services, after the full review of these requests by the appropriate standing committees of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service, being such a vital part of the Nation's system of communication, must meet these minimal standards of service:

First, next-day delivery within a 500-mile radius;

Second, 3-day delivery within the United States outside a 500-mile radius from place of deposit;

Third, 6-day-a-week carrier service, including parcel post delivery;

Fourth, 6-day postal window services; and

Fifth, second-attempt delivery of parcel post.

I have included two very important provisions in this bill, to guarantee the Postal Service, in fact, furnishes these services. First, the appropriate standing committees of Congress, with legislative jurisdiction over the Postal Service, shall be required to annually conduct a full and comprehensive review of all administrative and managerial practices used by the Postal Service to implement and maintain the new standards of service. Second, the bill states that any managerial or administrative official who is found to have knowingly and willfully taken specific action to violate any of the service standards outlined in this bill shall be discharged from the Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must now act to end the current breakdown in services of the postal system.

The full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 5453

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to establish improved standards to achieve efficient mail service, to provide an effective method of reimbursing the United States Postal Service for public service costs while maintaining a reasonable postal rate structure, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Postal Service shall establish and assure, to all postal patrons, service standards which include but are not limited to—

"(1) Next-day delivery of mail deposited for delivery within a 500-mile radius;

"(2) Delivery within not more than three consecutive days of mail deposited for delivery within the United States outside a 500-mile radius;

"(3) Carrier service, including parcel post delivery, on a six-day-a-week basis;

"(4) Post office window service on a six-day-a-week basis;

"(5) Second-attempt delivery of parcel post.

Any administrative or managerial official of the Postal Service who knowingly and willfully engages in specific actions to violate any of these service standards, or to prevent or impede the efficient and effective application of and adherence to such standards, shall be discharged from the Postal Service.".

SEC. 2. Section 2401 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections (b) and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Public service costs, as determined by postal service, for providing a maximum degree of effective and regular postal service nationwide, in communities where post offices may not be deemed self-sustaining, as elsewhere, and in complying with the public service policy established under section 101 (b) of this title at reasonable and equitable rates and fees shall be paid out of the general fund of the Treasury and shall not constitute direct charges in the form of rates and fees upon any user or class of users of such public services, or of the mails generally.

"(c) The sum determined by the Postal Service to be equal to the difference between the revenues the Postal Service would have received if sections 3217, 3403–3405, and 3626 of this title and the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 had not been enacted and the estimated revenues to be received on mail carried under such sections and Act shall be paid directly out of the general fund of the Treasury.

"(d) The Postal Service, annually, in requesting authorizations for the amounts to be appropriated under subsections (b) and (c) of this section, shall present to the appropriate legislative and appropriations committees of the Congress a comprehensive statement of its compliance with the public service cost policy established under this section and section 101(b) of this title. In addition, the appropriate standing committees of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the Postal Service shall conduct annually a complete and comprehensive review of the administrative and managerial practices used by the Postal Service to implement the service standards set forth in section 101(b) of this title.

"(e) No appropriation shall be made to the Postal Service under subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section for any fiscal year unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress.".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3627 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The analysis of subchapter II of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—"3627. Adjusting free and reduced rates.".

(c) Section 3684 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Except as provided in section 3627 of this title, no" and inserting in lieu thereof "No".

DO NOT AX THE CRIME COMMITTEE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the diligent, low-key work of the Select Committee on Crime headed by my Florida colleague, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER of Miami, was the subject of a recent editorial but the Florida Times-Union in Jacksonville, entitled "Don't Ax the Crime Committee."

The editorial concluded that the committee under the leadership of Chairman PEPPER "handled serious matters seriously," and "dealt with sensational matter in a down-to-earth way."

I fully agree with the comments and conclusions expressed in the editorial of February 22, 1973, and add my personal thanks to Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER for a job well done. The editorial reads as follows:

DO NOT AX THE CRIME COMMITTEE

Rep. Carl Albert, speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, should back away from his plan to abolish the Select Committee on Crime chaired by Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Miami).

It has dealt with sensational matter in a down-to-earth way, without permitting the circus atmosphere that often has caused such committees to be little more than publicity vehicles for committee members.

It has handled serious matters seriously, with a view towards getting results. And if there is anything needed in the war against crime and drug abuse, it is results.

Pepper has been dogged and persistent in pushing for reforms which were clearly needed. And, in several significant instances, has been successful.

It took him nearly two years to get action to cut down on the manufacture of amphetamines but his persistence finally paid off.

The gap between the legitimate need and the amount being manufactured was huge. A large percentage of the overproduction was finding its way into the illegal drug market and was contributing significantly to the increase in drug abuse.

Some eight or nine billion amphetamine and related type pills were being produced yearly, according to the National Institute of Mental Health.

Testimony before Pepper's committee documented what was happening as a result of the overproduction. Eighty percent of the pills which were seized by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs had been manufactured legitimately and then found their way into the illegal drug traffic.

So loose were controls that one drug firm consigned a million pills to an address which narcotics agents determined to be the 11th hole on a golf course in Tijuana, Mexico.

Pepper kept fighting to curb the overproduction and finally the number legally manufactured was cut down to less than 10 percent of the former production. It was a significant victory for drug control, common sense and Pepper's committee.

Pepper at one time was considered to be an ultra-liberal and anathema to many conservatives. When he assumed the chairmanship of the committee, some feared that it would be another of those exercises in permissivity.

He fooled his critics by being fair, low-key and hard-nosed. He set the tone on the committee and the other committee members—five Democrats and five Republicans—have maintained that tone.

Albert can find other things to reshuffle in the House—things that are not working. Pepper's committee is working. Its reward should be additional support, not the political axe.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, JANUARY 1973

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the January 1973 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, JANUARY 1973

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of January 1973 was 2,807,326 as compared with 2,829,684 in the preceding month of December 1972. This was a net decrease of 22,358. Total pay in the month of December 1972, the latest month for which actual expenditures are available, was $2,770,679,000.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of January 1973 is compared with the preceding month of December 1972 and with January a year ago, as follows:

	Full-time in permanent positions	Change
Current change:		
December 1972	2,457,667	
January 1973	2,446,056	−11,611
12-month change:		
January 1972	2,552,081	
January 1973	2,446,056	−106,025
Current change:		
December 1972	331,083	
January 1973	319,898	−11,185
12-month change:		
January 1972	272,945	
January 1973	319,898	+46,953

	Total employment	Change
Current change:		
December 1972	2,788,750	
January 1973	2,765,954	−22,796
12-month change:		
January 1972	2,825,026	
January 1973	2,765,954	−59,072

Full-time permanent employment in the month of January was reduced by 11,611, reflecting primarily a decrease of 6,453 in Defense agencies and 3,577 in Postal Service. Over the 12-month period full-time permanent employment was reduced by 106,025, reflecting a decrease of 70,282 in Defense agencies and 51,821 in Postal Service, partially offset by an increase of 7,087 in Veterans, 3,358 in Treasury, 3,217 in Justice and 2,785 in HEW.

Temporary, part-time, etc. employment in the month of January was reduced by 11,185, reflecting decreases of 5,482 in Postal Service, 3,010 in Defense agencies, 2,957 in Agriculture and 1,536 in Veterans, partially offset by an increase of 3,505 in Treasury. Over the 12-month period temporary employment was increased by 46,953, reflecting increases of 24,706 in Defenes agencies and 10,520 in Postal Service.

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

Total civilian employment in the Executive Branch in January 1973, as compared with the preceding month of December 1972, is shown for civilian and military agencies, as follows:

	January 1973	December 1972	Change
Civilian agencies	1,685,172	1,698,505	−13,333
Military agencies	1,080,782	1,090,245	−9,463
Total, civilian employment	2,765,954	2,788,750	−22,796

Total Executive Branch employment INSIDE the United States in January 1973 was 2,607,525, a decrease of 20,575 as compared with December 1972. Total employment outside the United States in January 1973 was 158,429, a decrease of 2,221 as compared with December 1972.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET PROJECTIONS

Of current interest are the new budget projections (or "targets") for full-time permanent civilian employment levels as of June 1973 and June 1970. Comparison of current full-time permanent employment (January 1973) with the budgeted projections for June 1973 and 1974 follows:

	Civilian agencies	Military agencies	Total
January 1973, actual	1,424,675	1,021,381	2,446,056
June 1973, estimate	1,472,300	1,012,400	2,484,700
(Compared to January 1973)	(+47,625)	(−8,981)	(+38,644)
June 1974, estimate	1,451,800	986,800	2,438,600
(Compared to January 1973)	(+27,125)	(−34,581)	(−7,456)
(Compared to June 1973, estimate)	(−20,500)	(−25,600)	(−46,100)

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in January 1973 totaled 32,787, an increase of 432 as compared with the preceding month of December 1972. Employment in the Judicial Branch in January 1973 totaled 8,585, an increase of 6 as compared with December 1972.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during January 1973, showing comparisons with June 1971, June 1972, and the budget estimates for June 1973:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	January 1973	Estimated June 30, 1973 [1]
Agriculture	84,252	82,511	83,041	83,400
Commerce	28,435	28,412	28,656	28,200
Defense:				
Civil functions	30,063	30,585	30,120	32,400
Military functions	1,062,741	1,009,548	991,261	[2] 980,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	104,283	105,764	109,104	[3] 110,200
Housing and Urban Development	16,030	15,200	16,435	15,800
Interior	57,570	56,892	56,821	57,000
Justice	42,662	45,446	45,944	47,200
Labor	11,352	12,339	12,479	12,800
State	23,398	22,699	22,472	23,200
Agency for International Development	13,477	11,719	10,895	10,800
Transportation	68,482	67,232	66,326	67,700
Treasury	90,135	95,728	97,544	103,000
Atomic Energy Commission	6,920	6,836	7,051	7,000
Civil Service Commission	5,324	5,260	5.705	6,000

Footnotes at end of table.

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT—Continued

Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	January 1973	Estimated June 30, 1973[1]
Environmental Protection Agency	5,959	7,835	8,006	8,900
General Services Administration	38,076	36,002	36,134	38,100
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,478	27,428	27,196	26,800
Panama Canal	13,967	13,777	13,735	14,000
Selective Service System	5,569	5,791	5,633	5,700
Small Business Administration	4,004	3,916	4,046	4,200
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,612	14,001	14,193	14,000
U.S. Information Agency	9,773	9,255	9,225	9,400
Veterans' Administration	158,635	163,179	168,337	171,600
All other agencies	31,333	33,499	34,029	35,800
Contingencies				2,000
Subtotal	1,955,530	1,910,854	1,904,388	1,915,200
U.S. Postal Service	564,782	594,834	541,668	569,500
Total[4]	2,520,312	2,505,688	2,446,056	2,484,700

[1] Source: As projected in 1974 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.
[2] Excludes increase of 5,000 for civilianization program.
[3] Excludes increase of approximately 9,000 in adult welfare categories to be transferred to the Federal Government under Public Law 92-603.
[4] January 1973 figure excludes 2,610 disadvantaged persons in public service careers program as compared with 2,768 in December 1972.

THE PERFORMANCE OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states that—

Congress shall have the power to establish post offices and post roads.

For almost 200 years our Government carried out this mandate—and carried it out admirably.

Like many people, however, I felt that our postal system could become even more efficient and hopefully less costly if it were run on a more businesslike and less political basis.

The presidentially appointed Kappel Commission confirmed the view that—

A Postal Corporation owned entirely by the Federal Government be chartered by Congress to operate the postal service of the United States on a self-supporting basis.

To this end it staged that a board of directors should be—

Charged with providing the nation with a superb mail system offering universal service at fair rates, paying fair wages to postal employees and giving full consideration to the public welfare.

Stated the Commission optimistically:

The nation should not be asked to run the risk of a breakdown in its postal service. The Corporation management should not only upgrade the reliability of day-to-day mail delivery to both urban and rural areas, but should also turn its attention to the unfilled needs of the public for additional postal services, such as guaranteed fast delivery. Only a Post Office quick to identify and meet market needs can successfully serve a changing economy. Obsolete and inefficient postal facilities should be replaced. Existing technology must be fully applied and new technology brought to bear through vigorous research and development. Every effort should be made to provide postal employees with a work environment comparable to that found in the finest American enterprises.

In 1966, the Chicago Post Office came to a screaming halt. Ten million pieces of mail were backed up. The 1968 Kappel Commission reported:

Similar incidents have occurred in many other cities. Despite valiant efforts, delays occur even in first-class mail; backlogged bulk mail is common. The facility and management problems of Chicago, in varying degrees, exist in post offices all over the country. In the Commission's judgment, particularly with mail volumes continuing to increase, the causes which produced Chicago may well produce the same results elsewhere.

What disturbs me and a lot of the employees of the Postal Service and huge numbers of my constituents is that the situation has not changed since the Postal Service was established.

One telling index to the utter failure of a product or an endeavor is the number of jokes it generates.

First there were Edsel jokes. They gave way to TFX and F-111 jokes. Now Postal Service jokes have become a national pastime.

For example, while the fighting in Vietnam was going on in full fury, people were saying, "Let's turn the war over to the Postal Corporation: They may not end it, but they'll sure slow it down." Others said: "Don't do that, they'll only lose it."

Now the line is: "Smash the Mafia—mail it parcel post." And they tell a story about the time former Postmaster General Winton Blount sat in on a brainstorming session on the problems of mail delivery:

"I've been listening patiently now for three hours," Blount finally said in exasperation, "and all I want is a simple answer to a simple question: If it is neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night that is holding up the mail, then just what the hell is the trouble?"

The week's best effort has to go to Washington Star-News reporter Miriam Ottenberg who had a suggestion for next year's Christmas stamp. It could say, "O Lord, Deliver Me."

America's grand experiment in a quasi-private Postal Service was intended to slow down mailing costs and speed up mail delivery.

In 1968, the Kappel Commission had found a "pattern of public concern over the quality of mail service. Delayed letters, erroneous deliveries, damaged parcels, and lost magazines are everyday experiences." If the Kappel Commission were to do a reexamination today, I expect that they would find the same conditions—only more so.

Of the 75 national associations asked to comment on the quality of mail service by the Kappel Commission in 1968, 47 faulted the Post Office. I strongly suspect that if the same 75 associations were questioned today, few of them would have favorable comment to make.

After a year and a half of operation, postal administrators have apparently decided the only way to speed up cost reductions is to slow down the mail—slow it down to the point that the Postal Service is now a disservice—a disservice to the taxpayers who must depend upon it, and a disservice to the many dedicated people who work for it.

The Kappel Commission stated that—

Certain kinds of postal functions have a higher potential for cost reduction than others. The retailing and delivery activities may be considered the "institutional" functions of the postal system. Their costs depend less on mail volume than on the size and characteristics of the area served. Increasing urban sprawl requires more collection and delivery notes and more retail outlets to bring not so much in technological advances as in more efficient use of this institutional capacity.

The Postal Service Corporation, however, is trying to reach a financial break-even point too rapidly. It clearly cannot be done this fast without postal service itself breaking down.

I urge that the Corporation slow down its economy measures rather than slow down the mail. Congress had realistically called for a gradual phaseout of Government subsidies by 1984. But following Mr. Blount's lead, the Corporation seems determined to try to become self-sustaining long before then and it clearly is not working out.

I think they are being unfair to the whole concept of an independent, solvent Postal Service—which is still in an experimental stage—by charging too many things too fast.

Even senior Assistant Postmaster General Murray Comarow has admitted:

We probably did go too far in our effort to save money.

The Postal Service has made a succession of hasty and ill-advised policy decisions that have in many places slowed mail delivery to a crawl. They include:

A totally unrealistic hiring freeze.

A top-heavy administration.

Qualified employees who unwisely were urged to retire early.

Attempts to automate mail handling with untested systems.

Reduction of mail service.

To compound the problems, these factors and others have caused the morale of postal workers to reach an all-time low, according to postal union officials.

Postmasters have not been allowed to fill vacancies—even in suburban post offices where new housing developments have greatly increased the population. Overstaffed and understaffed operations have been treated alike. The end result has been that employees are forced to work mandatory overtime week after week. This is causing the Postal Service time-and-a-half wages and has reduced efficiency among workers.

Some post offices have become so understaffed by retirement and resignations that mail has piled up beyond the ability of the remaining staff to handle it.

The freeze reduced the payroll by 63,470 employees from July 1970, to February 1973. As of last month the Postal Service was down to 677,746 employees. Over the same period, the mail volume increased by 2.3 billion pieces of mail.

While all this was going on, the fatcats on the postal payroll were doing very well. Twenty postal officials earn $42,000 a year or more, according to a survey conducted by Congressman H. R. GROSS in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The 20 high-paid postal officials equal the number of high-paid executives authorized for the entire Federal executive branch, Cabinet members excluded.

The old Post Office Department had eight Assistant Postmasters General. The new Postal Service Corporation has 17 Assistant Postmasters General and a new category of five senior Assistant Postmasters General.

Two offers of early retirement to postal employees since July 1971, have eliminated the most knowledgeable and experienced employees from the postal work force. More than one-quarter of the supervisors have retired since July 1971.

I believe that automation is a sound step in the right direction. But in the Postal Service's haste to automate, systems have been designed around machines that are still on the drawing boards, equipment has been purchased without contracting for proper installation and maintenance, and new machines have been introduced without giving proper training to the employees who will run them.

As an example, centralized automated mailing centers were planned. Before the first center had been completed so that techniques of distribution could be tested and perfected, the Postal Service committed itself to a $5 billion construction program for more centers.

And there is a great deal of question whether this concept will work. It is a radical departure from the old way of distributing mail, which used to be based on the neighborhood post office. Centralized mail handling might be a great idea. But it should be tested before $5 billion is committed to it.

Mail service has been greatly curtailed. The long-standing policy of delivering today's mail is dead.

As a Senator from California, the most populous State in the Nation, the opinions of my constituents serve as a good barometer of what is going on in the whole country. Before the Postal Reorganization Act went into effect, I was receiving a few letters every day about poor mail delivery service. Since July 1971, when the Postal Service took over, the mail has steadily increased. There are now many days when I receive 50 letters complaining about the Postal Service. There have been some days when the number has reached 100.

The complaints come in several categories: From private citizens who are not receiving packages and letters from loved ones and who have suffered financial losses because mailed payments have not gotten where they were supposed to go within the allowed time; from businesses that are losing revenues because they can not be depended upon to get merchandise through the mails nor can they get billings out and payments in on time; from postal employees who complain that hiring freezes and forced overtime are causing the mail system not to function properly because there are not enough people to move the mail and because the employees who are working have become so demoralized.

Writes Mrs. Irmgard Lenel of Santa Monica, Calif.:

I received a newsletter from Pasadena, marked in large letters on the outside "Urgent," sent bulkmail and dated December 22, on January 20, announcing an important event which of course had long since passed. Bulkmail, it is true, but as long as this kind of service is authorized it appears to me it should be impermissible and unthinkable that it should take 4 weeks and one day for a piece of mail to arrive from Pasadena to Santa Monica [a distance of some 25 miles].

Mrs. Ned Laveaga of Orinda, Calif., says:

All the cute things they have for sale are nice . . . and the colorful public relations posters are pretty, but all that does not get the mail delivered in time. Orders are being lost, I could be fined by the government for getting my taxes in late, and personal messages arrive days after they are supposed to. Has anyone else been complaining about this? I would think big companies would be very frustrated.

States the general manager, Howard R. Leistner, of one large company in Richmond, Calif.:

I consider the mail service at this time to be critical. We mailed a payroll summary to Paramus, New Jersey on December 14, air mail, special delivery. It was not received until December 22nd. We again mailed payroll summary information to Paramus, New Jersey by air mail, special delivery on December 28, 1972, and had a call on January 2nd from the payroll department that it had not been received. To give you some idea as to what these delays mean in terms of manhours and dollars to us, please allow a further explanation. An accounting clerk in this office spends almost one full day preparing payroll information for approximately 25 hourly employees. When this information is not received in New Jersey in time for it to be placed into the computer and payroll checks issued, this office must give to the New Jersey office line-by-line information via long distance telephone. This takes from 45 minutes to an hour; an added expense we are forced to absorb.

Mrs. Chester E. Bechtle of Hermosa Beach, Calif., has this story to tell:

My husband is very ill and I have to buy medication from a druggist who is in Redondo Beach [the next town] and he kindly mails me the pills and I send him a check. It took four days for the check to reach them and its only ten minutes on the bus but I can't leave my husband.

Another of my constituents, Mrs. Lorene F. Tarr of Grass Valley, Calif., put it this way:

We have been sending our packages via United Parcel Service because the parcels have better care, it is not necessary to pay extra for insurance under $100, the cost is much less and service is overnight within California. If this company can do this, why can't the U.S. Postal Service?

The costs of slow mail to businesses were calculated by Mr. R. C. Chapman, president of the Great Plains Western Corp.:

We began doing some checking of how long it took money to reach us once mailed. I calculate that for the last 90 days of 1972 our mail was delayed an average of three days in arriving here. Cross city mail frequently took four extra days. Cross country mail frequently took from ten days to two weeks. On any given day we would have some one million dollars coming to us in sales proceeds from meat packers and others. We receive all payments by check. Since we borrow large amounts of money and pay an effective 8 percent and better interest on same, delays in receiving one million dollars cost us at the rate of $219 for each day's delay. Figuring an average delay on all mail costs us approximately $1,533, or at an annual rate of $79,716. If you multiply our situation by that of other businesses, the costs of delayed mail delivery must come to billions of dollars per year. We are in the cattle raising business. Higher expenses translate themselves into higher prices for consumers. Part of the blame for higher meat prices must be laid at the foot of the post office department that is responsible for such conditions.

Mrs. Helen Schneider from Vista, Calif., sent me a copy of her letter to her life insurance company:

Enclosed is voided check No. 730101–239725 as you requested. It arrived the same day the replacement check arrived. Seventeen days is a long time for mail to come from Boston particularly when it is after the New Years period.

In a note to me Mrs. Schneider added:

Getting the replacement check involved a long distance call to my former company in New York, a night letter to John Hancock and a telephone call to John Hancock in Boston. There's $10 shot right there.

Writes Mrs. Martin Fletcher, of Palo Alto, Calif.:

This year (Christmas season) we received more Christmas cards after Christmas than before. A letter postmarked December 21 in Massachusetts arrived here December 29. A letter takes two days from San Francisco to Palto Alto—about thirty miles. A monthly program guide to radio station KKHI previously delivered a week or ten days prior to the end of the preceding month is now delivered nine days after the start of the new month.

A very sad letter came from Mrs. Russell H. Fluent, of San Francisco. She wrote:

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I regret my first letter to my Senator is in a form of a protest regarding the Postal Service. These are the facts: My elderly sister who lived in Long Beach, California had been ailing and living alone. On December 27, I wrote her a letter and sent it air mail so she would have a line from me before the New Years holiday. I took the letter to the Stonestown Station myself, because if I get there before

4 P.M. it is sent on its way that day. I could not understand why she did not answer my letter and I became worried so last Sunday, January 7, I called her on the phone. There was no answer so I kept trying for about three hours until I called the manager, only to learn that she was found on the floor and she had passed away. I arrived in Long Beach on Monday, January 8 and while I was there the air mail letter I wrote her on December 27, was delivered. I am enclosing the envelope and the date on my letter, and as you can see it hasn't even been cancelled out. Is it possible that it takes 13 days for an air mail letter to arrive from San Francisco to Long Beach? I felt very sad and depressed to think she hadn't heard from me since a letter means so much to people living alone.

Senior citizens are especially dependent on mails because fixed incomes limit the alternative methods of communication and because retirement checks themselves are sent through the mail.

Another example of the kind of hardship poor mail service can work on the elderly came from Mr. Howard D. Moon of the Alhambra Hearing Aid Center in Alhambra, Calif. He writes:

Whatever the reason for the delay in the delivery of mail, it nonetheless is a serious matter in our business. We mail hearing aid batteries most every day to our customers who live short distances from our office. It used to be that if I mailed them around 5 o'clock, they would receive them the next day. I can't rely on that any more. I had a call from one of our customers on the 9th of January—she had not received her batteries that I sent on the 4th of January. Five days to go a few miles from Alhambra to Monterey Park.

Mr. Maurice Manley, of La Puente, Calif., wrote:

I am a sales representative for a major petroleum company. Five weeks ago I had a case of sprays in aerosol cans come and the case was thrown around so much two cans were damaged and the contents leaked out. Then I got three grease guns wrapped together and a hole was torn in the box. Because of carelessness, part of one gun was gone. Last night a customer called to tell me a pin and all the wing nut screws were lost out of his shipment. Tonight I checked with another customer and part of his grease gun was gone. I went to the post office and complained and was told if I wasn't happy about it I could write to my Congressman, which I am.

Mrs. Myrna S. Holder of Costa Mesa, Calif., had placed a Christmas gift order with a company in Mount Vernon, N.Y., on November 21, 1972:

The package was small and light as it contained flat, personalized Christmas tree ornaments for friends and children; some of the ornaments also included an engraving of the year 1972. I hope you can imagine my concern, frustration, disappointment and desperation when the packages did not arrive by Christmas. Replacement gifts had to be purchased at the last minute or embarrassing apologies made. The package finally arrived January 11, 1973, a little late for Christmas, and also a little late for the dated ornaments to have any relevance. I think you will agree that 38 days is a long time—Pony Express would have been quicker.

From Burbank, Calif., Mr. Joe C. Wilson, who is the national vice president of the National Association of Government Employees, wrote:

The Civilian Technician is paid on a biweekly basis with the payday normally being every other Wednesday. However, during the past eighteen months their pay checks have been from one to six days late. During the past three months the situation has worsened considerably . . . this consistent and unexcused delay has placed an undue burden on many of these employees. Some have been forced to make late payments on their bills, some have had to borrow from their friends and relatives to meet their commitments, and have been placed in precarious and embarrassing predicaments with their creditors.

Many periodicals which depend on timely information for their publications are losing articles and delaying publication, because of late mail. In one instance, the Los Angeles Times interviewed me about the performance of the Postal Service. The article appeared in the paper on time. Unfortunately, the pictures that were to accompany the article were omitted. The reason: They had been sent through the mail and had not arrived.

The Kappel Commission stated:

A successful organization's management must be flexible to respond quickly to changing customer and employee needs. The individual manager, customarily responsible for the results of the operations he directs, must be allowed discretion to shift his resources in response to changing circumstances.

The old Post Office, hampered by thousands of congressional statutes, was unable to respond to the needs of the communities it was supposed to serve. The new Postal Service, hampered by fears of disloyalty of its employees, has clamped regulations so rigid upon its management people that they are less able than ever to use their professional judgment to move the mail.

The results of this policy are reflected in the sad letters from employees of the Postal Service. First they beg me not to release their names. A great deal of pressure has been placed upon them not to contact their elected representatives. I would find this kind of harassment hard to believe. However, one of the many Assistant Postmaster Generals met with two members of my staff. He explained to them that the Postal Service had not yet succeeded in getting the proper amount of loyalty from postal employees and that "until they are fully indoctrinated" they must not be allowed direct contact with the Hill. That has not stopped many brave souls from letting me know just how bad things have gotten. I introduce for the record a memorandum showing the kind of policy that is being set.

In addition to written policy statements, there have been reports of at least one major California post office where there has been a not-so-discreet effort to "fire the handicapped" by penalizing them for doctors appointments and pressuring them even during hospitalization to retire. Promotions are promised and training provided—then the opportunities are removed. They tell me about the centralized mail units where the machines to operate them are not installed and where the mail which has already been delayed by transportation to the centers is being further held up because there are not enough people to sort it. Mostly, postal workers want to let me know that they are trying hard to move the mail despite the many handicaps.

In addition to jokes, another good measurement of failure is the success of competitors. While use of parcel post is dropping off, competitive package mailing companies such as United States Parcel are doing more and more business. I am disturbed by reports that the Postal Service is not recommending parcel post rate hikes at the same pace as other rate hikes in order to squeeze competitors off the market.

I believe the Postal Service must take the time to study innovations before putting them into use. The Postal Service must also afford to its midlevel management personnel the training and skills along with the flexibility to cope with problems unique to their localities.

Cutting out mail deliveries so that businesses cannot operate efficiently, removing collection boxes so that the poor and the elderly have no place to send a letter, closing small branch post offices—which are a drop in the postal financial bucket—in communities that are rapidly growing, and closing down post offices on Saturdays so that working people have no opportunity to use them just are not the ways our once proud mail system ought to be operating.

Said former Senator Ralph Yarborough in his eloquent speech against enactment of postal reorganization on June 30, 1970:

The issue is plain and simple. Are we going to keep this branch of the U.S. Government for service, or are we going to turn it into a profit-motive thing that will subordinate service to profit?

I believe that question remains to be answered.

TRIBUTE TO GOV. WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of the distinguished former Governor of Arkansas, Winthrop Rockefeller.

There is so much to say in praise of this man, I hardly know where to begin. His great humanitarian efforts were directed on many fronts.

Winthrop Rockefeller was a big man—tall and husky. But his physical appearance was dwarfed by the greatness of his commitment to helping others. Born to wealth beyond most men's dreams, he had a richness of spirit which surpassed most men's hopes.

I will remember him particularly as a fighter, a real scrapper, for the small guy in this country. I will never forget his appearance before the Select Small Business Committee, on which I serve as ranking minority member, last May 2. At that time he spoke with compassion and wisdom on the topic of the "Future of Small Towns and Rural America: The Impact on Small Business."

I also served in 1968, and again in 1972, with Win on the National Republican Platform Committee. I knew him as a politician and public servant of unsurpassed dedication and integrity.

Before the committee and at the conventions he did battle on behalf of the small businessmen, the farmers, and all of the other residents of rural America.

Despite his family fortune, Win Rockefeller was not afraid of hard work, whether it was manual labor in the Texas oil fields or desegregating State jobs in Arkansas.

He fought with determination for reforms in Arkansas just as he had fought with courage during World War II.

His term of service as Governor of the State of Arkansas saw that State's first model cities program as well as its first general minimum wage law. It was truly an "era of excellence" for Arkansas.

I would be remiss if I did not also mention his devotion to history through the Historic Williamsburg Foundation, his contributions to the arts, and his activities in the areas of health and education.

In the death of Win Rockefeller, the Nation has lost a friend. His contributions to the State of Arkansas and to his country will endure for many years to come.

CIVILIAN EXECUTIVES IN THE U.S. NAVY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy has a long and colorful history dating back to the Revolutionary War. Partly because of its long history, however, the Navy has had time to develop a civilian bureaucratic establishment which far exceeds that of the other services in many ways.

Now that we are in peacetime and are seeking ways to free badly needed funds for important domestic programs, it is time to raise certain questions about our huge Navy bureaucracy:

Why does the Navy have as many civilians in Washington—33,000—as the entire U.S. Army and Air Force combined?

Why does the Navy need twice as many "supergrade"—$30,000 plus—bureaucrats as the Air Force and 55 percent more than the Army?

Why does the Navy require almost 18,000 civilians to fill its top—$18,737 to $42,500—salary ranks?

These questions involve not military strength, but bureaucratic excess. Furthermore, it is clear that the Army and Air Force, whose tasks are certainly as important and as complex as those of the Navy, require proportionately far fewer civilian executives to support their military forces and equipment.

If the Navy followed the example of the other services regarding the number of civilian executives actually needed to properly run a military organization, then millions of payroll dollars might be freed for use in the realinement of our national priorities.

AN AMERICAN DREAM, OR A DREAM DEFERRED?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker:

This letter is to plead with you or anyone else who can save the children who will be hurt by President Nixon's cut backs. I am a mother of three children and a black woman. In spite of the pitfalls society has made for blacks and minorities. My son has a chance to win a scholarship to College. It's bad enough so many doors have been slammed on our children and our lives as well but throughout this his grades have excelled.

I'm really beginning to feel Nixon's attitude is that of someone who wants hopelessness to prevail in poor people lives he keeps preaching self help and determination but those who are trying to hold on are the main ones being destroyed by his decisions.

I am divorced and a working woman, its only right that I get something for the taxes I am required to pay by your laws. So many of my people have taken a do or die attitude. Is this all that is left as an alternative, God I hope not. Anyway please put your conscience and support behind our future, our children.

Give them the chance that was denied my generation. One of the programs, that will be affected is College Bound of Haren High School of which my son is a student. They have one of the most constructive programs around. They have intensive guidance services, reading laboratories and cultural activities. Extensive Math and English classes.

Also upon completion of College Bound program he is guaranteed admission to College with a 75 average, plus financial assistance, my son's average is 82.02. So you can see my desperation.

This is one in a multitude of letters I have received protesting President Nixon's proposed budget and its elimination of a great many social programs. This particular letter is referring to cuts in title I funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Emergency Employment Act. The college bound program, run by the New York City Board of Education, is a college-preparatory and academic improvement program serving over 10,000 pupils in New York City public schools.

At this time, I submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the March 5 edition of the New York Times entitled "The American Dream."

THE AMERICAN DREAM

In his detailed message to Congress on human resources, President Nixon has outlined a major retreat by the Federal Government from its social responsibilities. He seeks to abolish the community action programs begun as part of the Johnson Administration's war on poverty and to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity established to direct that war. He would withdraw Federal money for neighborhood mental clinics, hospital construction and regional medical programs. He abandons his own plan for welfare reform.

Beyond these specific cutbacks, the President proposes "reforms" in the areas of education and manpower which are probably the prelude to major reductions in Federal investment in the future. In place of numerous specific programs established to help children in elementary and secondary schools and to train the unemployed, Mr. Nixon offers "education revenue sharing" and "manpower revenue sharing."

But the nation's Governors who held their annual midwinter meeting in Washington last week were unable to discover how much of this special revenue sharing money would be available—or for how long. The truth is that no President and no Congress can bind their successors to a specific level of appropriations.

That is also true under the existing arrangement where Congress annually approves money for specific programs. But Congress is much less likely to cut a program which it authorizes and supervises than it is to cut a broad grant of money to the states which they would then be free to spend pretty much as they see fit. That explains in large part the attraction which so-called special revenue sharing has for the Administration and for many conservatives. It makes politically easier a drastic future shrinkage of Federal spending for education, manpower training, health, housing and other social problems while leaving to the Governors and Mayors the disagreeable task of coping with the problems with less Federal help. Just yesterday Mr. Nixon added urban development programs to the list of "outmoded" Federal efforts, passing on the responsibility—and financial uncertainty—to state and local governments.

Many of the nation's Mayors and Governors who lobbied so vigorously last year for general revenue sharing are already disillusioned. As Mayor Wesley C. Uhlman of Seattle told a Senate hearing the other day: "Most of us have applauded revenue sharing, but it has not turned out to be the savior of the cities we thought it would be. Instead, it's a Trojan horse, full of impoundments and cutbacks and broken promises."

If this disillusionment exists about general revenue sharing, the Mayors and Governors are understandably wary about the President's special revenue sharing plans. Those plans look suspiciously like an old-fashioned conservative Republican effort to collapse existing Federal programs and hand the problems back to the states and communities—with less Federal money to meet them.

President Nixon's latest message further arouses this suspicion because of its cavalier dismissal of his own welfare reform bill. He gives no excuse for its abandonment except that the Congressional outlook was unfavorable. Yet the bill twice passed the House of Representatives. It might well have passed the Senate last year if the White House had been willing to make common cause with liberal Democrats and conduct a floor fight in its behalf.

The abandonment of the "services strategy" expressed in dozens of specific Federal programs makes no social sense unless it is replaced by an "income strategy." That was the rationale underlying the Administration's welfare reform proposal ever since it was first proposed in 1969. Yet now the President wishes to continue cutting back on specific programs without offering any income-producing substitute for the welfare poor and the working poor.

It is the President's skills at politics and salesmanship which enable him to present this bleak program dressed up in all its verbal finery as "the New Federalism," "the Second American Revolution" or, as in last week's message, "the fulfillment of the American Dream." The dream looks remarkably like right-wing nostalgia for the days when individual self-reliance and states' rights were regarded as a sufficient answer for every complex social problem.

The citizen who wrote me that letter is struggling to fulfill the American dream for herself and her family. I am afraid that under the President's policies she will instead experience the dream that the black poet, Langston Hughes, wrote of:

What happens to a dream deferred?
Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun?
Or fester like a sore—
And then run?
Does it stink like rotten meat?
Or crust and sugar over—
Like a syrupy sweet?
Maybe it just sags
Like a heavy load.
Or does it explode?

COURAGEOUS POW'S

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some speculation that our returning prisoners of war have given rehearsed statements when they disembarked from the planes at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines. I find it difficult to believe that any American who watched this moving event could doubt the sincerity of these brave and courageous men. Rather than questioning their statements, we should be grateful as a nation for their service and total dedication to God, family, and country, and welcome the future returning American prisoners with the same unaffected enthusiasm demonstrated by these men already released.

I have had the opportunity to talk with a returned prisoner from my district in California, Lt. David Rehmann, U.S. Navy, and, therefore, have firsthand knowledge that in no way were these men briefed as to what they should or should not say.

A February 23 editorial in the Wall Street Journal expresses my feelings quite clearly and I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE SPIRIT OF THE POW'S

Americans haven't had much to boast about as a result of deep internal divisions over the Vietnam war, but no one watching the emotional return of the POW's could fail to be moved by their reaction. Despite vestiges of the military discipline that helped them through their ordeal, most POW's clearly returned as individual free spirits instead of dispirited automatons. As Vermont Royster notes on this page today, it was a proud return.

The coming home ceremonies were carefully programmed to insulate the POW's from the stresses and strains of an abrupt return. Yet the best laid plans of the military and civilian brass immediately went out the window as well-wishers and POW's interacted with unrestrained emotion and jubilation.

The welcoming ceremonies were also devised to give POW's a sense of America's pride in their sacrifice without exposing them to the larger divisions in American society. In their comments—from Navy Capt. Jeremiah Denton, a prisoner for nearly eight years who said simply, "We are profoundly grateful to our Commander in Chief and to our nation for this day," to Navy Lt. Cmdr. Everett Alvarez, a prisoner for more than eight years who said "we kept faith—faith in our God, in our President and in our country"—there was no mistaking their sincere pride in their mission and in the nation that wouldn't forget them.

Such spirit apparently is simply too much for some of our press commentators to take, so we are now being treated to the myth that the POW's themselves, rather than just the welcoming ceremonies, were programmed by the Pentagon. We are being asked to believe the spontaneous outpourings of affection for family, friends, colleagues and—especially—nation are all a vast put-on. If so, they would do credit to a Stanislavsky and Pavlov combined.

Such speculation will no doubt provide a neat rationalization for that petulant few who are disappointed the POW's didn't publicly denounce their country and condemn President Nixon, but it won't wash. It required no special insight to perceive that the emotions these soldiers displayed simply could not be programmed by the Pentagon or anyone else.

It is unlikely that anyone will ever be able to convince them that America is evil. Or make them believe that honor is a meaningless word. Or sell them on the idea that discipline and patriotism are outmoded concepts. It's only too bad each of those ideas enjoyed popularity for a time here at home.

It is generally felt the POW's afflicted by cultural shock will have a hard time adjusting to a changed society. Obviously, they will need sympathy, patience and understanding as they complete the wrenching psychological transformation from imprisonment in a closed society to freedom in a permissive one.

But for the moment they seem to be adjusting just fine. And, ironically, their courage and spirit may well help the rest of us to become reacquainted with the ideals of a nation from which some of us became needlessly estranged.

THE RETURNING POW'S

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we have signed a peace treaty, and for the most part, the fighting is over. But the last chapter in the grim story of the Vietnam war has not yet begun.

For our returning POWs, the war has not ended, and they will have battles to face in the coming months and years that may prove as difficult as any they fought in that far away land. We know their first need is for privacy and rest; to be alone with their families, to adjust to a normal life. But we must not let our respect for their privacy to be transformed into neglect. We must be ready not only to accept these men back into the mainstream of society; we must be willing to lend a helping hand at many points along the way.

They have suffered; it does not matter now that the war was condemned by many Americans. The returning POWs are fellow Americans, in need of help. We must all be willing to give it.

At this point, I would like to insert a recent editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which deals eloquently with the problems these men will encounter as they return to this country after being held prisoners, in some instances for as long as 6 years:

WELCOMING THE POW'S

Understandably, the expectancy and joy of those who will be welcoming home returning prisoners of war from Vietnam are mixed in with considerable uncertainty and, as reported in numerous interviews with POW families, sometimes with dread.

A host of questions arise for families who have not seen sons, husbands, fathers in some cases for periods of six or more years. Is he physically and mentally whole? Can we communicate across the lapse of years? Can he adjust from the memories of what was to the larger maturity of wives and children, brought on as much by the stress of prolonged separation as by the passage of years? Can both the returned POW and those to whom he returns establish new ties in the context of new modes of thinking and acting?

All of these questions are brought on, and exacerbated, by the fact that the past decade has been one of the most tumultuous in the history of the United States, with massive changes in the basic concerns of human life, ranging from sexual mores to the relationship of government to governed.

In the framework of these questions and this history of rapid change there must, of necessity, be some great adjustments on the part of individuals. But to say this is not to say that such adjustments are too difficult or impossible to make, provided proper mental, emotional, and spiritual attention is given to the task. On this score, many intelligent actions are being taken by individual families and by the armed services in such preparation.

Their program, which began with an overly zealous approach drummed up by a Pentagon task force as "Operation Egerss Recap," has happily begun to take more modest shape. Returned prisoners will be flown to U.S. military hospitals in the Far East. There they will be given personal briefings on accumulated pay, promotions and savings, as well as information about their particular families' situation. They will also be given a crash-course on political, social and other events in the U.S. and the world during their absence. All of this catching up is useful and, indeed, necessary. We trust it will be done in as unclinical a manner as possible, and as quickly as possible, so that the servicemen may be returned to their families where the real process of readjustment must take place.

We are reassured by the Pentagon's decision to assign a personal escort to each returning prisoner—where possible, a man known personally to the POW—who will act in any way possible to help ease the man back into his new situation. Wisely these escorts have been instructed not to discuss any possible violations of the military code that the POW may bring up in regard to his own or fellow prisoners' behavior during internment. This seems to indicate that the government is putting the accent on leaving the POW experience behind and looking ahead to a constructive new life.

Meanwhile at home, prisoners' families are reportedly making advance preparation for the return in most intelligent and sensitive ways. Aware that returning POWs have a mental image of how their homes looked, wives are keeping things as close to the same as possible. Changes and improvements can then be made with the participation of their returning men, all part of the re-engagement in home and family living.

We are also impressed with the maturity of some of the youngsters who will see their fathers for the first time in years. One teenage girl, whose father had written earlier that he had a mental image of her arranging flowers—a gentle art for which she apparently has no inclination—rejected a suggestion that she take up a course in home economics. "We'll have to accept Daddy no matter what shape he's in; and he'll have to accept us no matter what shape we're in," was her answer.

Perhaps this is a useful key to families and communities anticipating the return of POWs everywhere—a candid and uncritical acceptance of the man as he is, free of preconceptions and patient with his need to absorb and readjust to new circumstances.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALFONSO T. MONTOYA

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, New Mexico recently lost one of its most distinguished citizens with the death of State Senator Alfonso T. Montoya, brother of U.S. Senator JOSEPH M. MONTOYA. All of us from New Mexico are aware of his many contributions to our State, and I think that the eulogy read at his funeral perhaps best expresses our thoughts. Therefore, I would like to insert this eulogy in the RECORD at this point:

We come today to pay our final tribute to Alfonso T. Montoya, whose tragic death has diminished each of our lives. On these occasions it is hard to understand why the pattern for the divine fabric of life calls for the ending of his strand at an age when he had many years to contribute to his country, his state and to the lives of those with whom he came in contact.

Born in Pena Blanca on January 10, 1927 Al was a member of a family that has been represented in the area since the early 1700's. With a politically prominent family and with a brother who is a United States Senator, it would have been understandable if Al had relied upon the achievements of others. Yet he chose never to accept the easy role of wearing another's mantle of power. He sometimes even made his success more difficult by choosing to accomplish his goals in a manner that left no doubt that his achievement was truly his.

Al served in the Navy from 1944 to 1946, then earned his B.S. Degree at Regis College in Denver and his LLB from Georgetown University in Washington. He returned to New Mexico and began his practice of law. In 1958 he ran for the office of state representative and served one term in the House. He was elected to the Senate in 1960 and served from the 1961 Session until his death.

Al, as those of us who served with him in the Legislature knew him, was a warm and loyal friend, who could be counted on to do his best for any cause to which he was committed. He never went back on his word, and a commitment from Al was all you needed. He was a fighter who was at his best when the going was toughest, and he did it with a sense of humor that kept the fight from seeming grim. As an opponent he was without peer. He was imaginative and inventive in a political or legislative struggle, but he was never sly or underhanded. If he was unhappy with you you never had to hear it third hand. If what he did was going to incidentally affect some bystander he invariably had the courtesy to explain his action and the reason for taking it before he did so.

He was never so busy in furthering his own plans that he failed to be aware of the possible ramifications to those around him. He had an understanding of the problems of those in lesser positions around him, and he was careful that his actions did not hurt those who could not protect themselves, a rare quality in a man who had achieved the power and position he had attained in the political and legislative life of the state.

It would be difficult for the casual observer to assess his impact on the laws of this state, his legislative style was to be a quiet force rather than to seek personal notoriety. He chose to serve as a member, vice chairman and chairman of the Judiciary and Rules Committees during all but the last year of his legislative career. In that final year he shouldered the heaviest burden of his legislative career, that of chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

While the casual observer will find few bills that bore only his name, those who knew the workings of the Legislature find the impact of his personality indelibly imprinted upon the Legislature in which he served.

Some personal observations which I am sure that there are many of us here who will agree, Al always gave of himself by helping others, and many of those he helped were unaware of what he did.

He made no display of emotion but underneath he was very, very tenderhearted. His words could be caustic or generous and his spontaneous advice was always very forceful. There have been many tense moments in the Senate that have been turned into laughter by Al's keen wit. He was always fiery and always humorous, even sometimes when he turned it on himself. The members listened when he spoke seriously and laughed when he joked.

Al was blessed with a brilliant mind and he had a rare and unique ability to immediately see the fault in any of the proposed legislation and he acted accordingly. There are two sayings that he used very frequently which come to mind and many others. He would say "whatever is fair" and the other was, "I like you in spite of yourself." He used that many times.

And so, as we bid farewell to Alfonso T. Montoya, in hurt and bewilderment at our loss, we can only be thankful that we had the privilege of knowing him, and seek comfort in the knowledge that the State and the system that produced him and gave him to us for a while, will in time produce others of his stature.

CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the environment are never locally isolated. Indeed, they are international in their present scope.

The United Nations meeting on the Human Environment which was held in Stockholm last summer did much to structure a global response to the grave international problems of the environment. William D. Ruckelshaus, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, has observed that this Conference was a truly a significant one because it gave birth to a new world-wide environmental ethic.

Prof. George P. Smith of the Georgetown University Law Center Faculty has written an article dealing with the United Nations Conference appearing in the American Bar Association Journal. Professor Smith received his B.S. and J.D. degrees from Indiana University in 1961 and 1964. He is national cochairman of the environmental quality committee of the young lawyers section of the American Bar Association.

His article not only presents a balanced view of the complex areas of investigation, but offers insight into new, meaningful ways to resolve many of the problems. For those reasons I would like to share that article with my colleagues:

STOCKHOLM, SUMMER OF 1972: AN AFFAIR TO REMEMBER?

(By George P. Smith II)

The United Nations General Assembly, originally prompted by a Swedish initiative, decided in December of 1968 to convene an international Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm from June 5 through June 16, 1972, and to give purpose and meaningful direction to what has been considered an environmental revolution. It was to be the first conference of this type ever convened—a conference with a goal of developing various plans of action needed to improve the global environment instead of a conference for the mere exchange of papers by experts. It was also to be a meeting where the mood of the apocalyptic prophets was eclipsed by reasonable men and women of good will and hope who finally became aware of their sacred trust in preserving the the life systems of this planet.

"Only One Earth" was selected as the conference theme in order to stress the very fact that all things—both living and inanimate—among which man dwells are part of a single, interdependent system and that man has no place to turn if he despoils his own surroundings through thoughtless abuse.

A twenty-seven nation preparatory committee met four times after 1970 to develop the conference program. Various intergovernmental working groups held meetings throughout the 1970-1972 period. Nearly 400 national reports from eighty countries were assembled for study and analysis by the various working groups. These papers in turn were reduced to approximately 700-800 pages of official documentation for the Stockholm meetings. Some 120 countries participated in one way or another in preparing for the conference.

In order to increase citizen participation in the United States in the conference, Secretary of State Rogers established an advisory committee headed by Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., of Tennessee. Composed of representative persons and interest groups, the advisory committee met frequently, commented on all papers prepared for the conference by the United Nations secretariat and held public hearings on several of the proposals of the United States. It published a report, *Stockholm and Beyond*, in May of this year.

More than 1,200 official delegates from 110 states were accredited to the conference. The Soviet Union's absence was most significant. But this was discounted by some on the ground that the U.S.S.R. will have an opportunity to study the conference reports—as will the entire 132-member General Assembly of the United Nations—when the Draft Declaration on the Human Environment, the Action Plan and other papers are presented to the Assembly this fall for debate and, it is hoped, ratification.

Plenary sessions were held throughout the conference, and three committees concurrently studied a wide range of problems from managing human settlements for international quality and problems of resource management to the means of controlling pollution.

The chairman of the United States delegation, Russell E. Train, Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, stated at the outset that the conference would serve as a catalyst for action. He recognized that no answers might be forthcoming from the meetings, but he nonetheless felt that the hard questions so necessary for international advancement in the environmental area would be raised.

William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, who was a member of the United States delegation and who has shown himself to be a tireless advocate for environmental preservation, maintained that the most significant item on the conference agenda was the Draft Declaration on the Human Environment, for within the declaration was to be found a recognition and acceptance of an environmental ethic that would, together with the Action Plan, serve as a needed guide to all subsequent national and international actions.

Shirley Temple Black, also a member of the delegation, expressed her belief that educating the world community about the problems of the environment was the central purpose of the conference. Education translates into public awareness, which in turn can be channeled by citizen action into legislative responsiveness.

Robert S. McNamara, President of the World Bank, pointed out that throughout the developing nations, or third world, countless millions are threatened by a pervasive poverty that not only degrades but also destroys through hunger and malnutrition, illiteracy, unemployment and uncontrolled disease. Development of these nations stands little chance for real success unless the present distorted distribution of income—both at the national and international levels—is brought into a more equitable and reasonable balance.

Regrettably, as Professor Richard Falk has written, both the rich, developed nations and the underdeveloped ones specify self-interest in such terms as more wealth, more growth, more power, even more people. The quality of world order but reflects the interactions between national governments—with threats (economic and otherwise) and warfare being the main instruments of maintaining this order. Professor Falk believes that maximum national self-assertion is contrary to the collective ecological good.

A "greater generosity" by the developed nations toward the underdeveloped countries and the recognition of economics as a moral science were put forward to the conference by Gunnar Myrdal as the way to strike an environmental balance and chart environmental progress. Others believe, however, that co-operative planning and assistance, not unabated generosity, are the key to maintaining economic growth and preserving the environment for the underdeveloped countries. Professor Falk has suggested that the concept of ecological trade-off should be explored more fully and refined. For example, industrial countries might establish preferential trade relations with poorer countries that agree to use DDT and other pesticides in a safe, restricted manner.

Rene Dubos told the conference that efforts to go beyond the development of mechanisms designed to prevent or to minimize environmental defects must be undertaken. As the various nations and regions continue to differentiate—both in economic activities and in basic life styles—they must elaborate on new ways of relating to one another so as to become progressively integrated into organic wholes. Differentiation must always be followed by integration.

Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson) declared that separate drives, ambitions and policies must be made compatible with the continuing common life of a single, shared planetary system. Margaret Mead said that in order to muster the human will power required for the economic, social and aesthetic changes that will come about more distinctly in the next few years, there must be a realization of environmental danger, a belief that the danger can be overcome, and a new level of human relationships between all peoples of the world.

To the nations of the third world, however, the realization of environmental danger is of but passing interest in the light of their present needs for economic development. The danger simply is not viewed as something to cope with or overcome since it is not as serious as the problems of economic development. An appreciation of spiritual and aesthetic values must be postponed for the time being. It remains for the major developed countries to work with the third world in reaching a basic level of economic growth and stability that has a built-in environment awareness factor.

One of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter is that the U.N. will not interfere in the internal affairs of any country. The economic development of a country is an internal affair. By extracting a "commitment" to the environment in the Declaration on the Human Environment, perhaps an accommodation can be reached if the declaration is ratified by the General Assembly and adhered to by the signatories.

While Barry Commoner criticized the conference for what he believed was its failure to come to grips with the economic problems associated with the environmental crisis by specifically neglecting to give sufficient priority to improving the access of needy human beings to the good available on the earth, others chose to stress the fact that the United States delegation was too inflexible and insensitive in its approach to the problem of pollution, did not commit adequate financial support helping to reduce global environmental problems and had deficient credentials—especially since its membership included only one representative of a nongovernment environmental organization and no environmental scientist.

CONFERENCE DECLINES TO DEBATE VIETNAM WAR

The dominant criticism of the conference and of the United States delegation was their joint failure to debate the issue of ecocide and for the conference's failure to condemn "imperialist destruction and plunder" in Vietnam. China, as could be expected, was a front leader on both issues.

Ecocide may be defined quite simply as the deliberate destruction of a physical or cultural environment. The question was framed in this manner: Can war—and specifically the Vietnam conflict—be separated from the environment and a discussion of its survival? It was repeatedly asserted that there could be no separation of the two topics. In fact, it was suggested by the prime minister of Sweden in his welcoming address that the war was the environment's biggest problem.

The Chinese delegation insisted doggedly in daily debate—but finally to no avail—that the Indochinese conflict be included on the conference agenda. The United States was repeatedly accused of having committed "very serious crimes" in Vietnam and of having "destroyed both lives and the environment".

The United States delegation maintained that these issues were purely political and served only to obfuscate the real work of the conference, since they were impossible of solution or rational debate in Stockholm. Interestingly, the earlier fears that massive demonstrations against the United States' policy in Indochina would be commonplace at the conference never materialized.

DRAFT DECLARATION HAS ITS ACTION PLAN

The Draft Declaration on the Human Environment, adopted by the conference, consists of a preamble and twenty-five fundamental principles. The supporting Action Plan totals several hundred pages and comprises nearly 120 recommendations for international action. The framework into which those actions fit consists of three elements: global assessment (called "Earthwatch"), environmental management activities and supporting measures.

The genesis for this declaration is to be found in the early formation of the United Nations and the efforts of the General Assembly to structure the recognition of an international standard of human rights. Although the finished product the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, has no binding legal character, it deals with a theme of transcendent importance. So too, now, the Declaration on the Human Environment is directed toward the enunciation of a noble principle. Its basic purpose is to develop public opinion and stimulate community participation in the environmental protection sphere and then to set objectives for international co-operation and formulate guiding principles for world governments in the formulation of policy.

Although the United States delegation considered the final draft versions of the declaration uneven, it recognized the preservation of a number of extremely important principles of conduct for states in dealing with environmental problems of significant international import. Chief among these is Principle 21, which declares that the states have "the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other states or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction".

Of notable importance are such additional provisions as Principle 2, declaring that the earth's living and nonliving resources, and representative sample of natural ecosystems, must be safeguarded for present and future generations; Principle 6, stating that excessive discharge of toxic substances and heat into the environment must be halted to prevent "serious or irreversible damage" to ecosystems; Principle 16, calling for application of appropriate demographic policies where growth rates or concentration of population are likely to have adverse effects on the environment; and Principle 25, declaring the obligation of states to "ensure that international organizations play a coordinated, efficient and dynamic role for the protection and improvement of the environment".

The secretary-general of the conference, Maurice F. Strong, a Canadian, stated that the draft declaration must be seen for what it includes rather than for what it omits. He regards it as historic if only for the principle that states accept responsibility for the effect of their activities on the environment of other states.

"EARTHWATCH" IS CORNERSTONE OF THE ACTION PLAN

The assessment program, "Earthwatch", which forms the cornerstone of the Action Plan to make the draft declaration a meaningful document, would link established national and international programs and activities to permit co-operative international approaches to the identification and assessment of environmental problems of global importance.

Environmental management activities, or the second element in the plan, would be directed toward the development of measures for international cooperation designed to facilitate and support the management of man's activities that could have an impact on the environment as well as the management of certain environmental resources. While many of the anticipated activities can only be undertaken at the national level, many can be assisted through international co-operation.

The supporting measures of the plan include education and training, public information and organization and financing arrangements. The Action Plan states that education at all levels—from preschool to the university level—should evolve to reflect an environmental dimension.

President Nixon's direct efforts to advance the success of the Stockholm conference through the proposal of a fund for the environment were sustained by the conference. In essence, the President proposed that a voluntary United Nations Fund for the Environment be established, with an initial funding goal of $100 million for the first five years, which would be used to increase the capabilities for environmental protection activities within the U.N. The United States pledged up to $40 million on a matching basis. Japan and Sweden made specific commitments, and several other nations have said they are prepared to contribute.

To administer the fund, the United States delegation recommended the creation of the post of Administrator of United Nations Environmental Programs, together with an intergovernmental policy body (Commission for the Environment) to guide the administrator. A further effort to improve co-ordination at the administrative level would be an environmental co-ordinating board composed of senior executive officers in charge of environmental programs of the U.N.'s specialized agencies.

In addition to the declaration, Action Plan and the idea of an environmental fund, the conference: (1) urged completion in 1972 of a global convention to restrict ocean dumping; (2) recommended steps to minimize release of dangerous pollutants such as heavy metals and organochlorines into the environment; (3) called for early completion of conservation conventions, including the World Heritage Trust for natural and cultural treasures and a convention restricting international trade in endangered species; (4) called for world programs to collect and safeguard the world's immense variety of plant and animal genetic resources on which stability of ecosystems and future breeding stocks depend; (5) urged strengthening of the International Whaling Convention and a ten-year moratorium on commercial whaling; (6) recommended creation of an environmental referral service to speed exchange of environmental know-how among all countries; (7) urged steps to prevent national environmental actions from creating trade barriers against exports of developing countries; (8) recommended higher priority for environmental values in international development assistance, for example, more emphasis on conservation, land use planning and the quality of human settlements; and (9) urged greater emphasis on population policy and accelerated aid to family planning in countries where population growth threatens environmental and development goals.

HOW ABOUT A GLOBAL IMPACT STATEMENT?

Requiring any nation before undertaking a project to file a global impact statement—similar to that required domestically in the United States by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*)—would have a significant impact on the world environment and is believed by Mr. Ruckelshaus to have "fascinating possibilities". The acceptance of the principle implicit in this proposal is thought likely in the near future, but its present feasibility is quite another matter. The international community, Mr. Ruckelshaus suggested, is not ready to give any one organization the right to comment on every international project.

The third world would be especially reluctant to subscribe to any act that would impede their continued economic development. What might be more practical would be to structure criteria or "tolerance levels" and then proceed to allow the involved countries to adopt an individual standard according to a risk-benefit theory.

CONFERENCE ATTRACTS A VARIETY OF CHARACTERS

If one pierces the heavy rhetorical veil of Shirley Temple Black's and Margaret Mead's separate calls to the women of the world to rally around the flag of environmental preservation (and thereby liberate themselves from "something" or "someone") under the formation of a group called "Earth's Better Half", the post-Woodstockian flavors of Wavy Gravy and Hog Farm, the Dai Dong Conference, the seamen of NOAH, the Folkets or People's Forum, Pow Wow, Alternative Stad, the Black Mesa Defense, the Environmental Forum, the International Institute for Environmental Affairs and—of course—the United Nations conference itself, the real achievement of all of these becomes more manifest.[1] Stated very simply, these groups brought to bear a new appreciation or realization of *élan vital* and a concomitant understanding that the preservation of the life systems of the earth is correctly viewed as a spiritual commitment.

In a way, then, as suggested by Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, the United Nations conference was an important theological meeting because it provoked a debate on the environment and thereby prompted a reconsideration of the most fundamental question of human existence: What is man's chief aim on earth? What is his true relationship to nature or to the material environment that sustains his life?

Later generations, Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the U.N. said, may well look back upon this conference as a turning point—or that moment in history when a major correction was introduced in the process of the industrial revolution. For it was there that man first understood that his almost limitless capacity to innovate must always take place within nature—not outside of it.

THE NEW SOVIET IMPERIALISTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the Soviet Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade that the Soviet Union expects to sign an Export-Import bank loan of up to $250 million this week must be regarded as another of the peace-with-honor commitments—similar to aid to North Vietnam.

Reportedly, we are to finance $40 million for oil pumps, $20 million for the Kama River truck plant equipment and help the Russians develop their oil, copper, natural gas, and new products that will not harm your market.

At the same time as the Soviets are announcing their bid for "most favored nations" financing, using the 20-percent discount rate of the U.S. dollar through the Export-Import Bank of the United States, Victor Zorza, the noted columnist and Soviet-watcher in a copyrighted column outlines how some of the shrewdest American capitalists were taken in by an old sales trick employed by the Russians.

One need no longer ask who the imperialists are.

I insert several related newsclippings:

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Mar. 7, 1973]

U.S.S.R. EXPECTS EXIMBANK LOAN OF $250 MILLION

(By Dave Stern)

The Soviet Union expects to sign Export-Import Bank loan agreements which could total as much as $250 million by the end of this week, Vladimir Alkhimov, deputy minister of foreign trade for the U.S.S.R., said yesterday.

Alkhimov, who is visiting Washington, said that following the finalization of those loan commitments "amounting to up to $250 million" a contract of approximately $40 million for pumps for the oil industry will be announced. He added that around March 9 "we will announce the signing of another purchase agreement for equipment for the Kama River plant of $20 million."

The minister said, "We're well on our way to improved U.S.-U.S.S.R. trade. One of the major objectives now is to finalize trade agreements with our respective governments and iron out the "most-favored nation" problems.

"As trade relations improve we'll find new products to bring to the U.S. market . . . new products that will not harm your markets," he added.

He restated previous Russian trade offers of nonferrous metals, oil and natural gas, among others, but declined to add to the list. Alkhimov did say his country would be willing to supply the United States with all types of diamonds.

Alkhimov said "We could mine 400,000 tons annually of copper in Siberia." He said start-up costs for such a venture would amount to about $2 billion and suggested an international venture with half coming from the Soviet Union and the balance from foreign sources "including the United States."

With respect to natural gas proposals from Tenneco, Occidental Petroleum and El companies including Tenneco, Occidental Petroleum and El Paso Natural Gas, Alkhimov said, "We are in favor of this project but obviously it must be profitable to both sides." He said the U.S. Federal Power Commission is now looking into the gas project and indicated Russia is ready to deal as soon as is the United States.

He confirmed recent statements by Occidental Petroleum Chairman Armand Hammer concerning Oxy's fertilizer deal with Russia. "The fertilizer contract could be concluded by the end of this year. We're quite optimistic about that," he said. The negotiations involve Oxy's exchange of $150 million in fertilizer annually for a 20-year period with Russia for a like amount of ammonia and urea.

---

[1] Wavy Gravy was the leader of a "family" of fifty or more Americans who lived in and around two battered buses on an abandoned runway. The Dai Dong Conference, a transnational peace effort sponsored by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, derives its name from an ancient Chinese concept. The seamen of NOAH is a group of Danish men and women who live on a boat and work on ways to improve the human environment. Folkets or People's Forum was composed of several Scandinavian environmental and political groups who joined together when they thought the U.N. conference would not deal with the issues that concerned them. Pow Wow was a group formed in Stockholm a year before the conference to discuss, evaluate and develop parallel activities. Alternative Stad is a Stockholm-based group dedicated to the idea that human beings have the right to live in pleasant surroundings designed for people rather than cars and office buildings. The Black Mesa Defense is a group of Hopi and Navajo Indians dedicated to preserving Black Mesa, a sacred mountain, from strip mining to furnish coal for power plants. The Environmental Forum was conceived within the U.S. secretariat to provide a platform for accredited nongovernmental organizations. The International Institute for Environmental Affairs sponsored six lectures during the conference.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1973]

THE SHREWD SOVIETS

(By Victor Zorza)

Some of the shrewdest American capitalists were taken in last week by the oldest sales trick in the world—and by the Russians, at that. The businessmen, 800 of them, came to Washington to learn from a high-powered Soviet delegation about the huge deals which the Russians are offering to American corporations. The two-day conference was arranged by N. A. M., the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Russians soon confessed that they did not have the kind of money that could tempt the Americans. It was therefore up to the United States, they explained, to provide the credits and to make the purchases in Russia that would in turn enable the Soviet Union to buy American.

But—and this was the catch—they advised the Americans to hurry, because the Soviet Union was now drawing up a 20-year plan which would determine the pattern of its trade for years to come. If American business moved quickly, it would get in on the ground floor. But the Russians also made it clear that, if the United States did not offer the "right" terms, the Japanese and the West Europeans would be only too eager to do so—and that American business would be excluded from what was potentially the greatest market in the world.

The fear of Japan is now beginning to take in the businessman's mind the place once held by the Soviet bogey. The Russians know this and exploit it with considerable skill. Reactions at the conference convinced the Russians that they had found the right approach.

No one asked why the Russians were so anxious to do business with the United States if they could so easily get a better deal in Japan or Europe. The answer is that many of the things the Kremlin needs most can be obtained only from the United States. The gas and oil deposits, the copper and other minerals, with which the Kremlin is trying to lure American capital into deepest Russia are so inaccessible, so costly to exploit, that the projects would make economic sense only if they were to be developed on a truly gigantic scale.

Only the United States can think and act that big. Europe and Japan could not provide the necessary capital, nor the market to absorb the output, nor the advanced technology needed to get at the deposits, with which to make the Russian dreams a reality.

There are many other reasons, political and economic, why the Russians would prefer to deal with the United States. The Soviet Union could not have got from Japan or Europe the grain which Mr. Nixon provided, on favorable terms, to save the Kremlin from a serious political crisis. The Russians got those terms partly because they had managed to conceal the extent of their harvest failure.

They understated their needs, and could therefore pretend that if they did not get the right terms from the United States, they would be able to buy the grain from some of the smaller suppliers. But when the dust cleared they were found to have bought $1 billion of grain, which was available in that quantity only from American suppliers. The United States could have got a much better price if it had seen through the Russian game.

At the Washington conference the Russians reversed their tactics and grossly overstated the possible volume of trade. The purpose was to make American corporations compete with each other, as well as with foreigners, and induce them to offer the best possible terms now, perhaps even at a loss, in the hope of large profits in the future—and, to judge again from some of the remarks at the conference, it worked.

The business acumen of American capitalists is exceeded only by their ignorance of foreign politics, particularly Communist politics. This is going to cost them a lot of money, unless they find some way to learn how the Kremlin really works—and not just how to read the technical specifications in Soviet contracts.

Even a corporation like ITT is groping in the dark in its dealings with the Russians because it is not aware of the internal political implications of its proposals. ITT, which owes Avis, tried to teach the Kremlin about the car rental business. It knew that the Russian had tried, and failed, to build up a car rental network.

What it did not know was that this had become a politically explosive issue in the Soviet leadership. Similarly, it discussed with the Russians the introduction of ITT's Levitt modular housing in the Soviet countryside, without realizing that the Kremlin had been engaged in a disruptive debate about the building of rural settlements.

The United States can and should do business with the Russians, provided the terms are right, but unless its businessmen learn something about Soviet politics, and the Soviet trick of playing off one profit-hungry capitalist against another, they may come off second best.

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Mar. 7, 1973]

SOVIET JOURNAL HITS ROLE OF U.S. JEWS

MOSCOW.—A prestigious Soviet journal on U.S. affairs claims in its latest issue that American "Zionists" are jeopardizing "a most important factor" contributing to mutual trust—increased U.S.-Soviet trade.

The monthly U.S.A., the only Soviet journal devoted solely to American affairs, had sharp criticism in its March issue for U.S. Jewish organizations trying to influence the outcome of a congressional vote on granting most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union in trade relations.

A group of 250 House members led by Arkansas Democrat Wilbur D. Mills, who chairs the powerful Ways and Means Committee, has threatened to block the tariff benefits sought by the Nixon administration for Moscow unless the Soviets stop charging "ransom taxes" on Jews who emigrate.

The Soviet explanation of the tax is that it is designed to recover the cost of free education the emigres received.

A Senate resolution sponsored by Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., also demands the tax be lifted. It has the support of an estimated 80 of the 100 senators.

"Zionists aim to direct their blow first of all at economic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States," commentator Alexander Kislov wrote in the Soviets' latest blast at opposition to the trade provisions.

"And this is not by chance, since economic ties are a most important factor facilitating a growth of trust and, consequently, an improvement of the international situation in general", Kislov added.

The government news agency, Tass, distributed a summary of Kislov's article last night. The journal is due out later this week.

The shortened version of the article made no mention of the education tax, the prime factor complicating the approval of most-favored-nation status.

The article said the main reasons for the American "Zionists" campaign of anti-Sovietism" is to "divert attention" from Israeli's "brutal repressions in the Middle East, to instigate a new flareup of nationalistic sentiment among Americans of Jewish origin" and "to evoke anti-Soviet feelings among broad segments of the American population."

AN ANALYSIS OF RALPH NADER'S CONGRESSIONAL PROFILES—PART II

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second of two articles setting forth a Nader analysis made by the publication First Monday:

AN ANALYSIS OF RALPH NADER'S CONGRESSIONAL PROFILES—PART II

Charles Claffey of the *Boston Globe's* Washington Bureau writes: "Sadly, but perhaps inescapably, Ralph Nader's noble crusade has become a caricature of the institution he considers anathema to our society. Like the grotesquely huge corporations he has hectored for nearly a decade, Ralph Nader Enterprises is now itself big business, or big bureaucracy. The revenue may be meager, the salaries paltry, the goals lofty, but, nevertheless, creeping Parkinson's Law has overtaken the operations of the consumer champion . . . he has become the victim of his own success, spreading himself so thin that he must rely on people less able—and, frequently, less dedicated—than himself."

Prof. Ralph K. Winter, Jr. of the Yale Law School put it a little differently recently in the *Wall Street Journal*, saying: "Ralph Nader is a brand name. He's running a franchising operation, like Colonel Sanders' Kentucky Fried Chicken."

A senior wire service reporter who for over 30 years has covered the Congress told *First Monday* the Nader study had "nothing new in it, lots of errors of fact" and that the problem was "too many amateurs who didn't know anything about the Congress having to do a hurry-up job on something they were not familiar with."

Leonard Larsen, chief of the *Denver Post's* Washington Bureau, says of the congressional profiles that they look like what they are—"hastily, frantically thrown-together writings that were rushed to the publisher for release in the peak interest period of an election year." If they are strewn with error in basic political information." Larsen wonders, "how can the entire product—which has been lavishly described as the most authoritative study of its kind ever undertaken—be taken seriously as fact?"

The chief of the *Detroit News'* Washington Bureau, J. F. Ter Horst, says that the argument of the Nader critics that he is eroding his prestige by attempting to do too much will probably be buttressed by the latest Nader venture. Ter Horst says the congressional profiles are "partly misleading and surprisingly devoid of the kind of original Nader input that has characterized his past work."

Liberal Patricia Goldman, writing in the *Ripon Forum:* "To the average reader of the daily news, the information they purchase will be old. Most of the 'scandal' in the book is as old as the committee chairman against whom Nader rails. . . . The pity is that at a time when Americans are cynical enough about government, the book fails to give honest balance and perspective by pointing out that there are a significant number of honest and hard-working members of Congress."

Lee Bandy of the *Nashville Banner's* Washington Bureau: "The project is poorly constructed, repetitious in many instances, and full of generalities, flat statements without facts to back them up, editorial comment with a liberal slant, and factual errors."

An article in the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* by the Washington Bureau staff notes: "The bias showed through most strongly when the Naderers found a congressman or senator they liked. These profiles are embarrassingly effusive in their praise. Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota, for example, was virtually assigned the ability to walk on water." The paper quoted a Mondale aide laughing and as saying after reading his boss' profile: "Nobody is that good."

Davis Merritt, a reporter in the Knight Newspaper Washington Bureau: "The book won't convince knowledgeable skeptics, it will merely reinforce knowledgeable friends; and, most importantly, it will often confound and sometimes repel the earnest, average American who, starting with only what he remembers from civics class, tries to inform himself through the book. The average American is Nader's target, and the way the book will repel is by its totally combative approach. It starts from the basic activist bias that new is better and change is best."

Calling the profile on Wyoming Sen. Clifford Hansen "sophomoric," the *Cheyenne Tribune* editorialized on the charge that he spends an uncommon amount of time working on oil and gas legislation: "Considering that Wyoming is one of the biggest oil and gas-producing states in the nation, this should tie in very well with Cliff's posture assiduously working in behalf of his constituents."

The problem with Ralph Nader is that he has become corrupted by his own personal power. As James Kemper, Jr., president of the Kemper Insurance Co., put it in an address on December 7:

"The man who began his public carreer as a crusading author and publicist in a narrow field has become one of the most powerful men in America. His influence is enormous. He has the electronic and print media so much at his disposal that it is as if he owned them. Powerful legislators give him immediate audience. He now deals with the most corrupting of all the devils—power. And he appears to have fallen heir to the same arrogance, prejudice, dishonesty, irresponsibility and shoddy performance of which he accuses his targets. The hunter has acquired the characteristics of his prey."

MANY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CHALLENGE FACTS IN NADER STUDY

Many members of Congress have complained either about the study of Congress or their own profiles. A few examples are below:

In response to a request from a Nader staffer to correct the factual errors and misstatements in his profile before it was published, Rep. William Minshall of Ohio wrote Nader: "While I have long respected your courageous fight on behalf of consumers, I must join your other critics who believe you have now spread yourself too thin and are relying upon too many eager, but untrained, youthful aides. They have done you a disservice on this project. Their work is too distorted to be susceptible to accurate correction."

Rep. Albert Quie of Minnesota points out: "While this is a small item, you may have noted that in the book *Who Runs Congress?* the House Committee on Education and Labor is referred to as the House Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which leads one to believe that the authors were not too conversant with the House of Representtaives."

Rep. G. William Whitehurst of Virginia: "My overall impression is that it was too hastily done, and from the basis of too many preconceptions . . . The young man who interviewed me was a nice person, but he chose his questions to fit the stereotype he had in his mind of me as a 'rubber stamp' for the Pentagon, since I am on the Armed Services Committee. He did not touch on my environmental record when we talked, although I have introduced more animal protection legislation than anyone else in Congress . . . My own feeling is that in the long run it is the credibility of Ralph Nader, not that of the Congress, which is going to suffer as a result of this report."

Rep. Ed Derwinski of Illinois: "In reviewing my profile in the Nader study, I found many technical errors in the descriptions and statistics of my district. It was obvious that the interviewer became confused between my 4th Congresional District and adjacent districts. It was also clear that the interviewer took inaccurate notes. I was misquoted in several places and some of my statements reversed.

"My opponent's criticisms of me were quoted extensively, yet they did not bother to check their facts about him. I also felt that they became entangled in a web of painting me as an anti-Communist and disregarded other things which we brought to their attention.

"In essence, I believe my profile was amateurish and a sloppy job of reporting."

Rep. John Wydler of New York: "I corrected my Nader report and there were a lot of factual errors in it which I put right. The problem with the report is, of course, simple. It is basically written by liberals or liberally inclined people. They stress issues of importance to those who consider themselves liberal and the writing is done by college students who have no particular expertise in the field in which they are writing. The only thing that makes it important is that Mr. Nader lends his name to all these reports."

BLACKBURN CHARGES INACCURACIES

Rep. Ben Blackburn of Georgia: "After reviewing my profile, I feel safe to say there is inherent bias on the part of the writer. . . . One of the most significant errors in the report was a statement that in 1970 I had flown to Washington 250 of my supporters to attend a cocktail party at which President Nixon was present. She [the profile writer] supposedly obtained this information from the chairman of the Democratic party in my district. My staff strongly pointed out to her that this was completely untrue before the report was written and referred her to two newspaper reporters who had attended this fund raising activity and who had written articles outlining what had occurred. The facts of the matter are that 25 of my long-time supporters flew up at their own expense to attend a cocktail party at which Martha Mitchell was present. . . .

"My over-all impressions are that the reports were written by youthful, inexperienced, college students with the typical youthful preconceived biases against Republicans and, especially conservative members."

Rep. Edwin Eshleman of Pennsylvania: "The Nader report criticizes me for a drop in my attendance at sessions of Congress and my committee attendance during 1971. It points out that I missed 23 percent of the roll calls last year and attended less than half of the committee meetings. However, the profile fails to relate those absences to my hospitalization and recuperation from heart trouble during that period. Only a brief mention is made of the official leave of absence I had from the House of Representatives."

In addition to these examples, the *Ripon Forum* cites two more:

"Rep. Charles A. Mosher (R-Ohio) found a variety of errors and other cases of misrepresentation in his profile. In the chapter on staff, his administrative assistant is simply dismissed with the statement that she is an ex-airline stewardess. The administrative assistant was last a stewardess in the early 1940s. She has years of experience on Capitol Hill, including service as an assistant to three members of Congress and several committees. The implications of the profile and the facts differ.

"Rep. Pierre du Pont (R-Del.), reviewing his profile, found errors that necessitated a three-page letter. Errors included statements that the congressman often opposed public works bills, when he voted for all of the four public works bills considered in the 92nd Congress. The changes were sent to Nader by registered mail, and the letter was twice refused, necessitating the congressman to personally visit one of the project directors to hand-deliver the letter."

NADER TOO BUSY TO TESTIFY ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Ralph Nader talks and writes a lot about congressional reform, but it seems that when it comes time for him to testify before the Congress itself on the subject, well, he's just too busy.

Early last year when Rep. James Harvey of Michigan, chairman of the Republican Task Force on House Rules, was holding hearings on congressional reform, Ralph Nader was invited to testify. Through an aide, Wayne Neiman, he declined to appear because of previous commitments despite the fact that the hearings were spread over a three-week period.

Nader also declined to submit a written statement, even though to do so would not have required his personal appearance.

IS MARIHUANA FAR MORE DANGEROUS THAN PREVIOUSLY BELIEVED?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 16 years, Dr. Olav J. Braenden has served as director of the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory and for the past 5 years has given prime consideration to the effects of cannabis—marihuana and hashish—on the human mind and body. In addition, his laboratory has been a clearinghouse for the information developed by scores of scientific researchers in other countries.

On September 18 of last year, Dr. Braenden appeared as a witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in connection with the subcommittee's extensive inquiry entitled "World Drug Traffic and Its Impact on U.S. Security." Based on recent research, Dr. Braenden considers cannabis to be a dangerous drug, but further efforts are required to establish the severity of its effects. His testimony was supplemented by an appendix consisting of seven scientific papers involving 12 scientists in five different countries, all of whose findings were negative.

In view of recent statements in the United States concerning the legalizing of marihuana, Dr. Braenden's observations concerning the inadequacy of research on cannabis to date makes one logically question the medical basis on which the legalizing proponents depend. Stated Dr. Braenden:

In spite of the progress made in recent years, in cannabis research, much still remains to be done before we have an adequate understanding of the nature and effects of this complex plant. Very considerable research is necessary—particularly in order to isolate and characterize all the relevant constituents of cannabis; to definitely establish the active principles; to study the pharmacological effects of cannabis and its fate in the body; and also to determine the chemical transformations which occur in cannabis when it is smoked.

The issuance of the above-mentioned hearing was accompanied by a statement from the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, who cautioned against the rush by some sources to legalize marihuana. His statement is a brief and useful summary of the hearing, a copy of which hearing can be obtained though the subcommittee's office or purchase at the Government Printing Office.

I insert at this point the accompanying statement of Senator EASTLAND of December 21, 1972:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES O. EASTLAND ON PUBLICATION OF TESTIMONY BY DR. OLAV J. BRAENDEN, DIRECTOR, U.N. NARCOTICS LABORATORY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Chairman James O. Eastland (D-Miss) of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee today distributed the printed version of testimony of Dr. Olav J. Braenden, Director of the U. N. Narcotics Laboratory, before the Subcommittee on September 18.

The testimony was supplemented by an Appendix which reproduced the text of seven scientific papers dealing with the various effects of cannabis (marijuana and hashish) on the human mind and body. Among other things the printed scientific papers found that cannabis accumulates in the fatty tissues of the body, including the brain; that several years consistent marijuana use can result in irreversible damage to the brain; and that marijuana produces an alarming percentage of fetal deformities in animals, similar to Thalidomide.

In a statement he issued in connection with the publication Senator Eastland strongly warned against any precipitate action to legalize marijuana before more scientific information is available. The text of Senator Eastland's statement is as follows:

"The publication of this volume of scientific opinion dealing with the effects of marijuana and hashish on the mind, body, and personality of those who use them comes at a very opportune moment.

"The past several months have witnessed a rash of statements and publications urging the legalization of marijuana. Consumers Union has produced a $12.50 volume which purports to be a comprehensive survey of recent scientific research calling for legalization; and, at the other end of the political spectrum, the respected conservative publication, *National Review*, has joined in the chorus calling for an end to all legal restrictions on the use of marijuana.

"The real question at issue, of course, is just how much harm marijuana does—individually and socially. If it is true that it does no more harm than alcohol or tobacco, then it would be difficult to make a legal case against its use. On the other hand, even the most avid marijuana advocates would not argue in favor of legalizing the sale and use of strychnine—and very few of them would argue in favor of legalizing LSD. They know that strychnine is a deadly poison; and they know that LSD can do devastating damage to the mind and to the chromosomes. Presumably their attitude toward marijuana would also change if it could be demonstrated to their satisfaction that its human and social impact is comparable to the impact of LSD.

"On September 18th, the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security took the testimony of Dr. Olav Braenden, the distinguished scientist who has served as the Director of the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory in Geneva for the past sixteen years. Under instructions from the United Nations, Dr. Braenden has placed prime emphasis on cannabis research for more than five years now, and his laboratory has also served as a clearing house for the information developed by scores of scientific researchers in other countries.

"In his testimony Dr. Braeden told the Subcommittee that recent research point strongly to the conclusion that marijuana may be far more dangerous than had previously been believed. He said that no one questioned the fact that cannabis was dangerous, but further research was needed in order to establish the degree of dangerousness. Pointing to the experience with Thalidomide, Dr. Braenden said that it was better to be careful than careless in establishing drug policy.

"Dr. Braenden left with the Subcommittee a sheaf of some thirty or forty scientific articles dealing with various aspects of research on cannabis. In publishing his testimony the Subcommittee has included as appendices seven articles involving twelve scientists in five different countries. All of these research papers came up with very negative findings.

"An article published by Professor W. D. Patton of Oxford University, who heads up the British drug research effort, reports evidence that cannabis builds up in the fatty tissues of the body—which include the brain—in the manner of DDT, as well as evidence that cannabis produces fetal deformities in animals in a manner that resembles the damage done by Thalidomide.

"Another research paper, co-authored by four scientists, which appeared in the British Medical Journal, *The Lancet*, for December 4, 1971, reported that ten youthful patients with histories of consistent cannabis use, over a period of three to eleven years, showed serious brain atrophy—comparable to the atrophy that normally takes place between the ages of 70 and 90.

"A third paper, written by two Philadephia psychiatrists for the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, reported that patients who smoked marijuana consistently 'showed very poor social judgment, poor attention span, poor concentration, confusion, anxiety, depression, apathy, passivity, indifference, and often, slowed and slurred speech. An alternation of consciousness which included a split between an observing and experiencing portion of the ego, an inability to bring thoughts together, a paranoid suspiciousness of others, and a regression to a more infantile state, were all very common.'

"Some of these research papers have been the object of criticism by other scientists—which, perhaps, is only natural. However, according to people who have watched the scientific literature closely over the past several years, there has been a dramatic increase in the percentage of published scientific articles which report serious damage from both the short- and long-term use of cannabis in all its forms.

"Two years ago such articles were exceedingly rare: according to the overwhelming majority of the scientists who published findings at that time, cannabis was little different from tobacco and alcohol. But currently somewhat more than half of the published scientific articles point to the conclusion that cannabis is far more harmful to both the individual and to society than smoking or social drinking. In terms of its immediate impact on beginning smokers, it does indeed appear to be relatively innocuous. But the effects apparently build up with progressive use, resulting—in a relatively short period of time—in serious and irreparable damage.

"I do not question the credentials of those scientists whose findings appear to favor the legalization of marijuana. On the other hand, I am disturbed to note that some of the advocates of legalization consistently ignore the numerous reputable scientists who have been doing research on marijuana and hashish for years and whose findings point in the opposite direction.

"Thus, the book-length study put out by the Consumers Union makes no reference to the work done by Dr. Braenden of the United Nations Narcotics Lab; or by Professor C. Salemink of the University of Utrecht; or by Professor C. Miras of the University of Athens; or by Dr. O. Rafaelsen of the Central State Hospital of Copenhagen; or by Professor Patton of Oxford University; or by Dr. A. M. Campbell and his colleagues of the Royal United Hospital in Bristol, England; or by Professor Hardin B. Jones of Berkeley University; or by Drs. Kolansky and Moore of Philadelphia; or by Dr. Robert Baird of New York. It is easy enough, of course, to prove a thesis by ignoring all of the contrary evidence. But those who play this questionable game in the case of cannabis may unwittingly be encouraging a very grave social peril.

"It seems to me that any prudent person would want to know what any substance will do his mind and body before consuming it. When the scientific community is as divided as it is today on the question of cannabis, prudence would also dictate that we move with extreme caution in re-evaluating legal policy related to the control of marijuana.

"Both sides to the controversy would probably agree on the central point that more research is necessary.

"I am particularly impressed by the report of Professor Hardin B. Jones, Director of the Donner Laboratory at Berkeley University, that several hundred confirmed marijuana smokers who agreed to give up smoking experimentally for three months, reported to him that they had noticed a marked improvement in their mental functioning—that it was as though several layers of fog had been lifted from their mind. Prior to engaging in this personal experiment, not a single one of the marijuana smokers was prepared to concede that the smoking had in any way impaired their functioning.

"It is my hope that the Subcommittee on Internal Security will be able to take further testimony on this matter when Congress reconvenes."

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, before returning for the afternoon session, I had the honor of addressing a conference of the Pittsburgh Coalition for National Priorities.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this time the text of my speech to the organization:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

The 10 year struggle in Southeast Asia cost the American people more than $150 billion of its national treasury, the lives of more than 40,000 of its sons, and injury and pain to untold hundreds of thousands. But more important, that war sapped our strength and vitality as a nation. It ripped and tore the fabric of society, casting the young against the old, the haves against the have nots, and threw the forces of status quo against the legions of revolution and violence.

That war apparently has ended, although we still have "advisors" in Southeast Asia and we still are bombing people in Cambodia.

We are bringing home our prisoners and

trying to knit together that which was wrenched apart.

We must turn our eyes inward, without being isolationists. We must save our jobs and industry, without being protectionists. We must provide for our poor, without being paternalists. We must clean our air and water, without being alarmists.

It will not be easy.

With the signing of the Vietnam peace agreement, our nation for the first time during the postwar period has the opportunity to direct most of its energies and resources to correcting many of the social and economic ills that have plagued our nation in recent years. The turbulent events of the 1960's and early 1970's have clearly demonstrated that we can no longer afford the continuation of widespread poverty in the midst of plenty, spreading urban decay, an undernourished and totally inadequate system of transportation, serious environmental pollution, excessive unemployment, inadequate health care, and the cancerous growth of illicit drug traffic in our society.

Yet, despite these pressing domestic needs, the Nixon Administration has adopted a set of budget priorities which, if approved by the Congress, could in my view seriously threaten the economic and social well-being of our nation for many years to come. Though I agree that federal expenditures should be kept within noninflationary limits—given, of course, present rates of taxation, I find myself in fundamental disagreement with (1) the new thrust of the Administration's budget policy and (2) its choice of fiscal priorities.

In his radio address to the American people on January 28 of this year, President Nixon proudly announced that the budget for the coming fiscal year ". . . will not require higher taxes. It will not drive prices higher, and it will give us the change . . . to make our new peace a new era of progress." He went on to declare that ". . . it is time to get big government off your back and out of your pocket."

Undoubtedly, many Americans were pleased to hear these words. However, what many of our fellow citizens fail to realize is that the President has single-handedly authorized the termination of more than 100 federal programs, which will mean sharp cutbacks in the funding of many vital civilian services. On the other hand, the Administration refuses to prune defense spending or recommend the closing of billions of dollars in tax loopholes which serve to benefit only the rich.

Now how does the President plan "to get big government off our backs and out of our pockets" and at the same time embark on a new era of progress?

First, despite $4 billion in savings derived from the ending of our involvement in the Vietnam conflict, he is asking that the fiscal 1974 defense budget be increased by $4 billion, representing a total rise of $8 billion in non-Vietnam spending.

Second, to cut inefficiency and waste, the President is suspending badly needed subsidies for low income housing. Yet he is leaving untouched tax shelters for real estate speculators which robs the treasury of more than $500 million every year.

Third, King Richard takes pride in noting that expenditures for the so-called "human resources" component of the Budget will rise faster than military outlays. Yet, he fails to tell the American people that the great bulk of this rise in social spending will be due almost entirely to a $10 billion rise in social security benefits, which he opposed last year—yet took credit for in notes sent to each recipient.

Fourth, the President has reneged on his oft-repeated pledge to institute (1) a system of property tax relief for the elderly and (2) major reforms in our national welfare system—which all agree is wasteful and counterproductive in its present form—this is not progress.

He has submitted to Congress a budget that carries obituaries for many of the landmark social programs developed in the Kennedy-Johnson era; including: subsidized housing, model cities, community action, public service employment, education of culturally deprived and handicapped children, vocational education and the like.

These are only a few of many such examples contained in the President's statement of national priorities. Yet the message comes through loud and clear. The President has declared peace in the war on poverty and withdrawn most of the nation's forces. As Art Buchwald noted, "All weapons used to fight the war will be dismantled and shipped out of the combat zone."

I only wish the President had brought the Vietnam War to as hasty a conclusion as he obviously has directed for the domestic war on poverty.

In making a recent declaration that our nation's cities have passed the hour of alarm, the President said "City governments are no longer on the verge of financial crisis." He implied that all was healthy and progressive in our big cities.

I'm wondering which cities he visited before making that rosy statement.

It couldn't have been Detroit, where the public schools are fast running out of funds. It couldn't have been Philadelphia, where the school system has barely avoided collapse. It couldn't have been Newark, which is teetering on the edge of bankruptcy. It couldn't have been Gary, Indiana, where the white community which dominates the local economy is pulling out, leaving a largely black and poor population unable to cope. It couldn't have been New York's South Bronx where there is massive physicial and social devastation. It couldn't have been, in his own backyard, where there is fear and desolation in the highest-crime blocks in Washington; and in couldn't have been in Pittsburgh where the people have received a small bit of tax relief but nothing else.

Where are these mythical urban residents who have benefited so much in recent years that the President can afford to curtail so many of the program which serve them?

They are not in Pittsburgh and I doubt if you could find many in other cities across the country. Mainly because the job of helping them and the cities is not finished.

They are not in Pittsburgh, because Pittsburgh residents need the more than 1000 units of housing lost in the Nixon moratorium. They need the 40 daycare centers, run by the Board of Education, now threatened by new HEW regulations. They need the work study program which, if changed, will push 1000 local college students out of jobs they must have if they are to stay in college. They need the meals on wheels programs which will cease to exist if the President has his way. They need the 600 or so jobs that will be lost when the Public Employment Programs goes under. They need these and dozens of other programs which Pittsburghers have relied on, and still must rely on, if they are to leave the welfare rolls and become proud contributing members of society.

When we should be marshalling our forces to eviscerate the problem of poor housing, lack of medical facilities, the multitude afflictions of the elderly, inadequate educational facilities, unemployment, and a dozen others, the President asks us to end or severely curtail the programs that serve this end and instead add four billion dollars to his Defense budget.

If Congress follows the scenario charted in the Administration's budget, we might avoid tax increases today but we will not escape tomorrow paying the price caused by the neglect of these matters.

The Nixon budget, with small exception, ignores rising local welfare costs, continued social disorder, worsening environmental pollution, lost educational opportunities, elimination of jobs, more costly and inadequate heatlh care, and time lost in transit due to the lack of a balanced and well managed system of transportation.

In my view, the Democratically controlled Congress—which also won a big victory at the polls last November—has no intention of ratifying this new direction in fiscal policy. Of course, the Congress realizes that our government must act responsibly in spending the hard earned tax dollars of the American worker. It also is painfully aware that the government must live within its means to avoid another round of serious inflation. Nonethless, the Congress will be abdicating its constitutional responsibilities if it allows the President to become—as he wants to be—the sole arbiter of the government's expenditure and tax priorities.

Hence, to avoid such an outcome, the Congress will vigorously oppose those fiscal actions slated by the President which we believe are not in the best interests of the American people.

As the principal controller of the Government's purse strings, the Congress, not the President, must establish an overall budget ceiling which is non-inflationary and yet takes into account the most essential social and economic needs of the American people—rich and poor alike. For once and for all, the Congress must exercise firm control over defense spending. We must maintain and adequately fund those domestic programs which are clearly needed at the national level in the war against poverty, pollution, urban blight, rural decline, and crime.

We must not follow the President's lead and throw in the towel on welfare reform.

We must take steps to attempt to assure the continuation of direct federal aid, including in particular categorical grants, to those areas of social and economic concern which should remain subject to varying degrees of federal control and/or coordination. This would apply particularly in the case of health and education and housing.

To provide additional revenues, the Congress must move now with a sense of urgency in the area of tax reform. Currently the government's revenue potential is severely strapped by many unnecessary and wasteful tax loopholes which are now estimated to deprive the federal treasury of about $10 billion annually. What's more, such tax privileges serve to benefit the rich and place an unfair and disproportionate burden upon middle and moderate income earners who account for the major share of federal revenues.

Finally, the current budget crisis provides a clear signal to the Congress that it must get its own house in order concerning the manner in which it reviews the budget process and appropriates federal funds. Time is fast running out. We must speedily adopt a comprehensive system of budget review, supported by adequate staffing, which will enable the Congress to not only work within realistic budget ceilings, but also to make more informed judgments about program costs versus benefits.

Last week, Senator Hubert Humphrey and I introduced legislation to accomplish just such a purpose.

On Tuesday, we testified before the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control on our legislation which would create a congressional office of Budget Analysis and Program Evaluation in the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee.

It is no coincidence that both Senator Humphrey and I are members of the JEC, a committee which has been years ahead of the Executive and other committees in Congress with its economic evaluation, investigations, and recommendations.

In essence, the Budget Analysis Office Senator Humphrey and I advocate would operate as a congressional Office of Management and Budget.

Shortly before formal receipt of the budget, our budget office would establish, after considerable study and analysis, a proposed level of expenditures, along with a projection of revenues and a decision as to whether the nation would best be served that fiscal year by budget deficit or a budget surplus.

It would forward this evaluation to the respective Appropriations Committee and if changes in revenue are recommended an appropriate proposal would go to the tax writing committees. The Senate and House Appropriations Committees would, within 15 days, develop a budget ceiling and report that figure to their respective chambers.

The membership would then vote on that dollar amount established by the Appropriations Committees and any disparity would be worked out in the normal conference method.

The budget ceiling figure chosen by the Congress would then guide the proper authorization committees in their adoption of specific program amounts.

The attractive feature of this bill is that by developing to a greater extent a capability which already exists in the Joint Economic Committee, we can provide the Appropriations Committees and the Senate Finance and the Ways and Means Committee, an economic analysis that would give a continuity and an interrelatedness to their actions which the Congress has never had before.

Clearly, the Congress faces stiff challenges in all of the areas of Congressional action that I have suggested. However, there is widespread agreement within the Congress that these and other steps must be taken, if we are to play an equally important role in the setting of our nation's fiscal priorities. Currently the President is trying to dictate to Congress and the Nation what must be done if we are to enter "a new era of progress". Hence, the Congress in my view has no choice but to proceed along the lines of action I have suggested. Otherwise, we will be granting the President virtually unlimited authority over the setting of national goals and depriving the taxpayers of their voice in government through their elected representatives in Congress. Under our constitutionally established system of checks and balances, the Congress and the Executive must operate as equals in the governmental process, if personal freedom is to be protected and meaningful social economic progress is to be attained in the years ahead.

This point was driven home loud and clear in a recent article that was prepared for the New York Times (March 4, 1973, p. 1) by John Herbers on the question of Presidential power vis a vis the Congress. I quote:

"Richard M. Nixon, in what he achieved in his first term and what he has undertaken in his second, is attempting an expansion of Presidential powers that could have more impact on the national Government than that of any President since Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"That is the opinion of historians, political scientists and other students of the Presidency who were interviewed during recent weeks while Mr. Nixon was restructuring his administration for another four years and challenging Congress to what could be a bitter struggle over the constitutional balance of powers."

Finally, in addition to the question of checks and balances, we must keep in clear focus the central thrust of the "New Federalism" as articulated by the President. This was perhaps best described in a recent observation made by Walter Heller, the distinguished former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Again I quote:

"Instead of restoring self-reliance, (the President) is putting self-interest on pedestal. Instead of restoring confidence in government, he is inviting contempt for government in general and Congress in particular. Instead of focusing efforts on higher quality of life, he is appealing to instincts of crass materialism. Insteam of 'if at first you don't succeed, try, try again,' his implicit motto on social programs seems to be, 'if at first you don't succeed, give up.'" (Wall Street Journal, Feb. 22, 1973, p. 12)

This in my view is not the appropriate path to meaningful and lasting social economic progress, as we hopefully begin a new era of paece. In sum, the "New Federalism" as presently outlined by the Administration is but a sorry caricature of the American dream. Thank you very much.

AN ANALYSIS OF RALPH NADER'S CONGRESSIONAL PROFILES—PART I

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is not often the publication First Monday and I can agree, but in their comprehensive analysis of Ralph Nader's Congressional Profiles I believe the article's accuracy and contribution to the public interest performs a valuable service for all who are interested in their Government. The first of two parts of the article follows:

[From First Monday, Feb. 5, 1973]

A SPECIAL REPORT ON RALPH NADER'S REPORT ON CONGRESS

"However, the real trouble was an error in judgment, in turning up too suddenly after leaving the track, and as the machine barely had speed enough for support already, this slowed it down so much that before I could correct the error, the machine began to come down, though turned up at a big angle. Toward the end it began to speed up again but it was too late, and it struck the ground while moving a little to one side, due to wind and a rather bad start."—Wilbur Wright writing in his journal about the first and unsuccessful powered flight, Dec. 14, 1903.

According to one of Nader's Raiders, Ralph Nader at one point outlined what he wanted his Congress Project to be, saying, "Hopefully it will be just like the Wright Brothers' first airplane." Now that most all the returns are in on Nader's most ambitious effort to date, it appears that his hopes have been realized and that there is much in common between the first man-powered, heavier-than-air craft and his project. That is to say that Nader's so-called "eye-opening and urgent report to the American people," like the Wright Brothers' first airpline, is under-powered, highly unstable, off course, barely got off the ground and after being up for only a few seconds has come crashing left-wing first back to earth.

To begin with, there is hanging over the entire Congress Project Ralph Nader's prejudicial remarks about Congress which clearly indicate that in studying the national legislative body neither he nor his so-called raiders were making any pretense at being objective.

NADER SHOWS BIAS

Nader tipped his hand over a year ago when, in announcing his study to a National Press Club audience, he stated not that his investigation would try and find out *if* the Congress is "largely at the beck and call of the executive branch and special interests" but rather than it *is*, and that he and his little helpers were going to expose the whole mess. Thus with his premise stated as his conclusion, the Congress was a sitting duck.

The Nader Congress Project, both the study of the Congress and the individual profiles of members, however, has drawn criticism from nearly everybody.

Undoubtedly the most damaging blows to Nader's credibility have come from those on his staff who worked on the project. Scripps-Howard's top-notch investigative reporter Dan Thomasson reports a University of Georgia student editor who worked on the project as saying that the whole thing was "superficial" and obviously motivated in part by a desire to influence the November 7 election.

Claudia Townsend, 20, news editor of the school's paper, the *Red and Black*, says that as a result of Nader's "dogmatic" decision to rush the report through before election day it probably will "fizzle" and do more damage to Nader than Congress.

"I would say I have less confidence now in the things Nader has done," Miss Townsend says. "The pressure and the hurry to get things done and get a report out is what helped me change my mind. I'm inclined to believe that is the way they operate all the time."

Miss Townsend, a senior and former Presidential Scholar, says that she and six others who worked on the project to compile individual profiles of congressmen are now writing a book about their experiences.

BOOK WILL CRITICIZE NADER

"There is no question that it will contain a lot of criticism about the Nader operation and the spirit of this project," she says.

The college-age researchers, Miss Townsend says, were originally told they would be doing in-depth investigations, but ended up compiling work from published sources—"a job any 10th grader could do."

Miss Townsend says the researchers are predominantly liberal, including herself.

Another Nader Raider critical of the Congress Project is Anne Zill, one of the original staffers who worked on the Congress Project for about nine months. Miss Zill, who calls herself an independent and says she voted for McGovern (she wrote his profile, too), says her "overriding major criticism" of the profiles is that they were not written for the average person—they are "too high-falutin, too *New York Times*ish."

On the subject of Nader himself, Miss Zill says that he "has made some bad judgment decisions" and that he is "not a good chooser of his lieutenants," frequently picking people who are often just as loyal to him and not truly competent.

Miss Zill also thinks that Nader's attacks on the so-called corporate state are "simplistic" and she disagrees with what she says is his idea "that lawyers should run everything."

Another criticism of the Nader Congress Project by one who worked on it is voiced by Daniel M. Taubman writing in the *Harvard Law Record* (Oct. 20, 1972).

Taubman, a topics researcher for Nader, says: "Errors of miscalculation, as well as single-minded leadership, contributed to discontent among many of Nader's Raiders. When college journalists protested that they could not write nine 30-page profiles together with research, during the course of three months, Nader responded that the format of the profiles had already been determined and that it would be impossible to change them. Faced with a near open rebellion, Nader agreed to allow profile writers an additional week to complete their work and a reduction in profiles from nine to eight.

"At first, some of the most vociferous writers were assigned fewer than eight profiles. Later, it turned out that only a handful would complete eight profiles, with the majority completing between five and seven.

"As a result of this poor planning Joan Claybrook ('a super-energetic long-time Nader associate') was forced to exhort profile writers to superhuman efforts, and many of them performed overtime, working evenings and weekends. On one occasion, Claybrook requested a Stanford law student who left in mid-August to get married to postpone his wedding date so he could produce another profile."

Adding to the miscalculation concerning the profiles was a more serious miscalculation involving the perceived values of committees and topics researchers. Says Taubman: "Nader, who had previously termed the profile requirements unalterable, and then changed them, again switched horses in midstream, deciding that a short book would be written not as an overview of Congress, but as a teaser to induce citizens to buy later, more detailed studies of committees and topics such as lobbying and campaign financing.

"Most topics and committee researchers felt the quickie book was a transparent device for shunting committee and topics studies to the background while the more timely profiles grabbed the spotlight. Committee team researchers were most vocal in their opposition, and many refused to assist in the writing of the quickie book, recently released *Who Runs Congress?*

"During this mini-crisis, Nader met with topics and committee members in an attempt to mollify them. As he had kept his ground with profile writers, so too with the committee and topics researchers: We are writing a quickie book, that's that. Now, does anyone have any questions?

NADER IMAGE SHATTERED

"'It was as if Mount Rushmore had crumbled,' a Harvard Law student said after attending the meeting. The students' image of Nader had been shattered."

Two questions remain about the Congress Project, Taubman says, implying that "yes" is the answer to both: "Has Nader placed too much emphasis on getting things done, at the expense of receptivity to differences of opinion of his co-workers? And in striving for a total output on the order of 17,000 words, has quality been sacrificed for quantity?"

In addition to being criticized by the very people who helped put it together, the Nader Congress Project has also drawn fire from many in the liberal media who have traditionally been sympathetic to Nader and his goals.

Time magazine says of the congressional study:

"The tract revels in recounting every instance of bribery, influence peddling and even criminality in the congressional history books, but it is neither explicit nor persuasive in presenting its view of the problems that short-circuit congressional progress.

"Nearly everything but Nader's intent is wrong about this book. . . . It is tendentious, hostile and superficial, and contains nary a footnote to indicate its sources. Hastily edited—Reviewing the book for the *Harvard Law Record* (Oct. 20, 1972), David Cocke says it was "written in two months, edited in one day"—the book is flawed by a number of factual errors and incorrected data."

TIME MAGAZINE RAPS NADER

Time characterizes the project as being "marred by unsubstantiated innuendoes and unconcealed bias." Specifically, the magazine singles out the favorable profile treatment accorded Senators Edmund Muskie—"it restores much of the Honest Abe image Muskie enjoyed before the primaries"—and George McGovern—"it is so uncritical as to seem reverential."

One reporter for a left-slanted national news magazine, who has covered Capitol Hill for over 20 years, told *First Monday* he thought the Nader study was a "goddamn outrage, a scissors and paste job." The reporter, who asked not to be identified by name, says he was "startled" by what Nader and his people had done "treating Congress like a bunch of criminals."

"This is shabby work," he declared. "Nader really missed the target on this one."

John Morris, writing in the *New York Times*, says: "When opinions of the writers crept in, as they often did, they usually reflected liberal points of view. . . . Complimentary opinions of liberals were sprinkled through many of the profiles. . . ." The *Times'* John Finney, who covers Congress for his paper, says he just "skimmed" the Nader book, and it was "pretty slap-dash."

The *Washington Post's* Mary Russell, reviewing the Nader study, also found some substance to charges that the profiles of members of Congress were naive and biased in favor of liberals.

NADER STUDY PRO-LIBERAL

"There is a tone that tends to condone the liberal who has voted against the war, against defense spending and for the consumer, and to be sharp with the conservative who has voted with business interests and the President," she writes.

As an example of bias, reporter Russell contrasts the treatment given Rep. Chet Holifield of California, a Democrat who has opposed Nader's position on the proposed Consumer Protection Agency, and Sen. George McGovern. While neither member gave an interview to Nader's investigators, Holifield's profile noted that he had "refused" to do so, while McGovern's noted simply that he was "unable" to do so. The Holifield profile also notes his refusal to give an interview under a headline, "Non-cooperation," while McGovern's is mentioned in a note at the bottom of the last page of his profile.

This sort of pettiness reminds one of what ultra-liberal Sen. Abraham Ribicoff is quoted as saying about Nader in Charles McCarry's book, *Citizen Nader:*

"I give Ralph high marks for all the good he's done. I forgive him for his childishness. . . . But he's becoming the national scold. I think Ralph's mistake is that he's begun to think he's God. If you don't agree with him, he'll turn on you."

The *Washington Star-News'* Shirley Elder and Dana Bullen write:

"Despite the aim of even-handedness, some of the profiles reflect the bias one might expect from an army of idealistic volunteers new to politics and dedicated to reforming the system.

"Writer Robert Schwartzman was easy on Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, for instance, ignoring a college exam cheating incident and making only passing reference to the auto accident at Chappaquiddick that took a girl's life and has never been fully explained.

"But the Ku Klux Klan background of West Virginia's Sen. Byrd is treated fully, leaving the reader with a suspicion that Byrd never really abandoned his philosophical ties with the Klan."

EX-TYDINGS AIDE HITS NADER

Reviewing the Nader Congress Project for Book World, Terrence Finn, legislative assistant to former Sen. Joseph Tydings of Maryland, scores Nader's hubris:

"Consumer and environmental lobbies are 'public' interest groups. The authors assume their good guys are the good guys, and vice versa. It [the book Who Runs Congress?] does not ask if the education lobby's emphasis on higher education at the expense of vocational training, or the health lobby's emphasis on medical research instead of caring for patients, is in the 'public' interest. But it does state what is surely questionable, that lobbies 'control' the flow of information to and from Congress.

"The three authors—senior members of Nader's staff—have forgotten that Congress, as a respresentative assembly, is a forum for competing interests in American society. Public policy is in part the result of the consequent conflict. All interests—public, private, special, whatever—should be heard. That some go unrepresented while others are unscrupulous or simply callous to fundamental needs doesn't justify naming one's own interests the national interest.

SIMPLISTIC ARGUMENTS

"Furthermore, it is simplistic to argue that effective interest groups are those with money while the poor and needy lack representation. The rejection of the SST, the inability of organized labor to repeal 14b, and the rise of the consumer movement suggest that money alone will not carry the day in Congress. Organization, popular support, the issue itself, and an understanding of the legislative process all count for much in lobbying members of Congress."

IMPACT AID PROGRAM

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would direct the Federal Government to begin to make payments in lieu of local property taxes. I offer this legislation as an equitable method of replacing the payments which are supposed to be made under the impact aid program for local schools.

The impact aid program, controversial since its inception in 1950, has been subjected to escalating attacks from the executive branch of the Government each year. More properly known as school assistance in federally affected areas, the impact aid program provides both for the construction of new facilities—Public Law 81–815, and for operating costs—Public Law 81–874. Payments for operating costs are based upon the number of students with parents working or living on Federal property times a rate of payment designed to reflect either the local educational costs per public of comparable districts within the same State or one-half of the national or State average per pupil costs, whichever is greater. The payments for construction are made primarily for the construction of facilities to meet increases in the number of federally connected students.

The formula for impact aid payments has been largely responsible for the mistaken impression many have of the program. Critics allege that impact aid payments go into districts irrespective of the needs of the schools. The result, they say, is that wealthy school districts often receive more assistance than poor districts. This criticism overlooks the purpose of the impact aid program, and I believe a straight payment in lieu of property taxes would clarify the reasoning behind the assistance.

It is inappropriate to view impact aid as Federal assistance in the same context as most Federal grant-in-aid programs. Impact aid is essentially a payment made in lieu of property taxes. Its purpose is not the advancement of a particular educational program as is the case with most of the programs of the Office of Education. Instead, impact aid represents an effort at partially compensating school districts for the revenue they lose through the inability of local officials to impose ad valorem property taxes on Federal installations. Because this is the case, I feel that it would be far more equitable for the Federal Government to make a payment based on local property taxes rather than the formula now used in the impact aid program.

Already, in many parts of the country, home owners are facing financial hardship as a result of property tax levels. In areas where the Federal Government has extensive installations this is a particularly acute problem. Jefferson County, Colo., which is in my district, provides a good example. Twenty-five percent of the land area of Jefferson County is owned by the Federal Government. This land has an assessed valuation of approximately $80.5 million. Most of the communities in Jefferson County have a mill levy of between 100 and 110. At a mill levy of 100, the schools and other units of local government in Jefferson County are losing over $8 million. annually. This is more than six times what the county would receive through impact aid even if it were fully funded.

Because the bulk of the ad valorem property tax is devoted to schools, between 70 percent and 80 percent in Jefferson County, it is the educational process which chiefly suffers as a result of extensive Federal holdings. At the same time, large Federal installations bring families with children into Jefferson. These children attend the Jefferson County schools on an equal basis with the children or persons who work for employers who must pay property tax payments. As a result of the Federal exemption, property owners and businesses in Jefferson County must pay not only their own share of maintaining the public schools; they must also subsidize the presence of the Federal Government. If the Federal Government would pay its share, local property owners would be accorded a measure of needed property tax relief.

Impact aid was designed to alleviate this situation to a small degree by recognizing the impact a major Federal employer could have on a school district. Unfortunately, impact aid has not been fully funded in recent years due to the fact that other aid to education programs are in greater favor. The fiscal year 1974 budget proposes to virtually eliminate impact aid altogether.

The bill I am today introducing recognizes the fact that a Federal installation employing a substantial number of people has an adverse effect on a community, because of the Federal Government's exemption from property taxes. The bill would direct the Administrator of General Services to pay to local governmental units in which 3 percent or more of the land area is Federal real property such amounts in lieu of taxes as he determines to be equivalent to the amount which would be owed if the land were in private hands. Undeveloped Federal land would be exempt from the payments required by the bill. Also, to the extent the impact aid program is funded, such payments would be credited toward the in-lieu-of-taxes payment provided by the bill.

PITTSBURGH'S UNITED BLACK FRONT PUSHES AHEAD

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with so much talk coming from the vicinity of the White House about the failure of the Kennedy-Johnson social programs, I would like to offer a living, breathing, successful rebuttal of that kind of talk. The United Black Front of Pittsburgh rose out of the shambles of our city's 1968 disturbances to become an organization in that black community that proved, given assistance and direction, that hard-core unemployed men and women can become working, contributing members of society.

The members of the UBF put together some Government assistance with their own ingenuity and sweat and produced a nonprofit economic development corporation that has brought jobs and pride to a community which was rapidly losing both.

The current edition of "Appalachia," a publication of the Appalachian Regional Commission tells the UBF story much better than I.

I include an article from the magazine in the RECORD at this time.

PITTSBURGH'S UNITED BLACK FRONT—WYLIE CENTRE INDUSTRIES, INC., PROVIDES EMPLOYMENT FOR BLACKS

(By Thelma Mrazek)

When people think of those in need in Appalachia, they usually think of poor whites, living in squalid shacks in mountain hollows. But throughout the vast mountain range that comprises Appalachia are several other minority groups—the Cherokee Indians living in the Great Smoky Mountains on the border of North Carolina and Tennessee, the Seneca Indians of western New York and the blacks scattered mainly throughout the rural areas of Appalachian North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi and grouped in the larger cities of the Region, such as Birmingham and Pittsburgh. (There are 1.3 million blacks in Appalachia.)

Many organizations in the Region are working to help these minority groups solve their economic and social problems. For example, Pittsburgh's United Black Front, Inc. (UBF) has made significant strides in helping the black community. Chartered as a nonprofit economic development corporation after the riots of 1968, UBF has focused its efforts on creating jobs for the black residents of Pittsburgh's Hill District.

"We got together so we could assist, train and instruct blacks who have been denied the opportunity to participate in the economics of business ownership and the control of neighborhood businesses," said Clyde Jackson, executive director of UBF.

To date the UBF has founded a nail production company with support and assistance from the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa) and the Small Business Administration. It has also opened a food superette (a small supermarket) in cooperation with Food and Products, Inc. With the profits from these enterprises and new capital donations, the UBF plans to acquire a small department store and a dry-cleaning establishment in the Hill District, where many businesses were destroyed in the riots.

But the UBF has also extended its activities to render a number of social services, providing information to blacks about governmental services, such as Social Security or welfare benefits. It has been referring people for employment, distributing food, clothing and toys on holidays, helping to plan and organize better housing, becoming involved in providing better health services, working in recreation, helping with the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer programs and organizing a summer fair, featuring the well-known singing group the Jackson Five, which raised funds and provided excitement and entertainments to the ghetto's youth.

"We have become all things to all people," said Sybil J. Gilchrist, Jackson's first assistant. "But the important thing is we are dedicated blacks committed to helping poor blacks and improving our Hill District ghetto. In the process we are trying to help all the civic, social and business organizations get it all together."

GETTING THE UBF TOGETHER

Clyde Jackson is generally given the credit for getting the United Black Front together. While serving a term in the penitentiary, Jackson converted to Catholicism. His translation of the Catholic liturgy into Ghetto English caught the attention of Bishop Wright of the Pittsburgh Diocese. As soon as Jackson became eligible for parole, Bishop Wright arranged for Jackson to be released to Dr. Emil Trellis, a psychiatrist who had given up a lucrative practice to help the residents of the Hill District. Dr. Trellis persuaded Jackson to join his community mental health team, which was emphasizing preventive, rather than curative, methods in helping ghetto residents.

During and after the riots of the spring and summer of 1968, several members of the mental health group, led by Jackson, began to meet and discuss what could be done to prevent further destruction of the community. To obtain a better idea of what the community felt needed to be done, the group took a survey. As a result of the survey, the United Black Front was formed, with its primary goal that of creating jobs and putting economic power in the hands of community blacks.

Jackson was appointed executive director and was joined by Henry Woods, a community worker who became program director. As the organization began its work, several other men joined the staff as program coordinators. Most had known Jackson in the penitentiary. All had grown up on the Hill. In the fall of 1968 Sybil Gilchrist left her job as secretary to the president of Mount Mercy College (now Carlow College) to become assistant director of UBF.

As a first step in getting economic development under way Jackson and his group went to Congressman William S. Moorhead (D. Pa.). Congressman Moorhead helped the UBF obtain a grant from the Economic Development Administration in the amount of $94,370 to aid existing ghetto enterprises and help new ones get started.

To comply with the terms of the grant, UBF became a nonprofit corporation. It established a board of directors, which at first was composed primarily of the poor from the ghetto but which has now added black professionals to assure a cross-section of people. The board, which meets monthly, sets the policy and guidelines for the organization. Staff members concentrate on special areas of interest such as health or housing, but "everyone pitches in to do any job when it is necessary," said Henry Woods.

The dedication of the staff has been proven by the fact that only one from the original staff has left, in spite of the fact that payrolls cannot always be met because the organization must run on donations and grants. "We only got paid eight out of twelve months last year," said Bob Lundy, a former prizefighter, "but that doesn't matter to me. This is the first time in my life I've felt useful. I did nothing before."

UBF NAILS TOGETHER ENTERPRISE

At his first opportunity Clyde Jackson approached the top management of Alcoa to obtain their help. Meeting with F. J. "Fritz" Close, then chairman of the board, and John D. Harper, president, Jackson outlined the purposes and needs of his organization. Impressed by Jackson's sincerity and dedication, the Alcoa executives agreed to undertake an internal search to determine whether an enterprise might be spun off and turned over to UBF to be owned, managed and operated by blacks.

In looking for an enterprise, Alcoa considered a number of factors: the complexity of the manufacturing process, the difficulty of skills required to manufacture the product, the demand for the product, the problems of obtaining new markets, the amount of capital required as an initial investment and the cost and availability of equipment. Soon Alcoa's search team landed on the idea of manufacturing nails from aluminum. Through a fortunate coincidence Alcoa was in the process of expanding one of its primary production plants and had surplus equipment for making this subsidiary product.

Negotiations for the establishment of a nail production plant began with Alcoa's entering into a full and equal partnership with UBF to establish Wylie Centre Industries, Inc. The company was named after the two main streets (Wylie and Centre) in the Hill District. A board of directors was formed, consisting of two representatives from Alcoa, two from UBF and one representing the black community.

The UBF raised $15,000 in seed money, and Alcoa agreed to lease its 13 high-speed nail machines and auxiliary equipment, worth a total of $250,000, to Wylie Centre Industries, Inc., for one dollar. They also agreed to be responsible for $150,000 in salaries for the Alcoa employees who would provide technical training to Wylie employees in mechanical skills, repair of equipment, manufacturing procedures, business practices, and to help the company to develop a marketing capacity. To assure a ready market, Alcoa agreed to market at least 60 percent of the plant's output through Alcoa channels. It also promised to give technical assistance and support for a maximum of two years.

As the venture becomes more successful, Alcoa's involvement will phase out, Alcoa will sell the equipment to the company for one dollar and will send the company on its way under experienced black ownership, management and production personnel.

Plans have also been made for the sale of stock, as soon as the board of directors feels the company is viable. First priority for ownership will go to residents of the Hill district.

After the UBF and Alcoa reached an agreement to form the company, they approached the Small Business Administration (SBA) for a loan in the amount of $180,000 to provide the capital necessary for salaries, rent and inventory. They then began to search for a suitable site. Eventually they located a 10,000-square-foot building in the Lawrenceville section of Pittsburgh. The SBA approved the loan, which was guaranteed through the Pittsburgh National Bank; UBF and Alcoa began to make plans to open the plant.

LOOKING FOR WORKERS

After financing, the next important step in assuring the success of any company is, of course, the employment of the right people. In the case of the nail factory, there was an added dimension to the job of finding workers: Wylie Centre Industries and Alcoa wanted to involve as many of the Hill District people as possible in the new plant. Ordinarily, that would have required an extensive and time-consuming effort by Alcoa and Wylie, complicating even further their already difficult job of starting a new industry.

Fortunately for Alcoa and Wylie, a ready source of identified potential employees was at hand. UBF had conducted a door-to-door canvass of homes in the Hill District to develop detailed information on the unemployed and underemployed persons in that ghetto area of Pittsburgh. The purpose of the survey had been to identify those individuals who appeared to have a very high potential for assuming jobs in industry and commerce but whose talents were not being used.

This UBF survey, a separate story in itself, had been funded with a grant provided by the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. With the assistance of consultants from the University of Pittsburgh, a number of questionnaires were prepared to be used by interviewers in making the initial canvass. Forms to incorporate the in-depth information on individual applicants, which were to be completed at UBF headquarters, were also prepared.

Thirteen people were employed under Manpower Development Administration auspices and through the local Community Action Program to assist five UBF staff members in making the survey. A number of people from the Public Housing Authority served as volunteer workers.

Spot radio announcements were beamed through radio WAMO, the only black radio station in Pittsburgh, directly to residents of the Hill District to make them aware of the survey and the reasons for it. Several public meetings were held for orientation, and local newspaper advertisements gave information on the survey. In addition, printed throw-away leaflets were prepared and distributed throughout the community.

During the course of the survey thousands of households were visited. Over 3,000 unemployed or underemployed adults were identified, interviewed and their work preferences and skills categorized. "We did a lot of walking and a lot of talking," said Bob Lundy.

Initially the surveyors encountered distrust and secrecy from interviewees. "There was no doubt the people were suspicious of us at first," says Sybil Gilchrist. "They thought we were fronts for the white man, trying to find out all about them. We had to overcome as much initial hostility from our own people as we did from the business community when we first approached them for help." Through the publicity and word-of-mouth support the suspicion gradually began to fade, and people came to UBF headquarters for voluntary interviews.

HIRING "RIGHT GUYS"

The UBF staff called prospective manufacturing employees from those interviewed in the survey, and an intensive search for a manager began. Jackson, Sybil Gilchrist and D.C. (Pete) Mathewson, who was appointed interim president of Wylie Centre Industries, interviewed the most likely candidates. Mathewson had been an Alcoa career man for 30 years and had experience in operating technology, management and training in both the United States and overseas. He was assigned to be Alcoa's chief technical assistance expert until the new company got started.

To select the manager, the three interviewers set up a simple rating system, and out of 25 people interviewed found seven qualified. "We had little difference in our ratings," said Sybil Gilchrist and Mathewson. "We were looking for qualities of leadership, intelligence, good motivation and someone who really believed in what we were doing," they agreed. The three sat down together and reviewed the qualifications of the seven applicants thoroughly. After sifting, discussing and evaluating, they came to an agreement on Louis Rowe, an employee of an engineering firm, who was studying for an associate degree in business administration at Allegheny Community College at night. Rowe had been a football star and a counselor to the Black Student Union at Pittsburgh's Clairton High School. He was offered the job and accepted, taking a cut in salary.

"I took the job because I believed in the idea," says Rowe. "I wanted to be a part of bringing about the success of a company such as Wylie. This was a chance for the black community to get the production and managerial skills necessary to become a part of the mainstream of American business. It will help bring an economic uplift locally and hopefully will spur increased support for black capitalism both here and in other areas of the country. These considerations were far more important to me than the money," he added. "It is true that the job offered far more experience than I would have been able to get elsewhere, and I could apply some of the things I have learned in school; but these were secondary reasons."

Rowe's first job was to hire the "right guys" to help him out. "When I heard about this job," said Rowe, "I did research on all the other companies started by or for blacks in recent years. I decided that most of those that had failed did so because they set up artificial criteria for the selection of their employees. Criteria like having completed a high school education or whether or not a guy had been in jail or on dope or had family problems didn't apply, I felt, to the life of ghetto people. I decided that motivation and whether or not a man had a sense of responsibility were the most important criteria for hiring. The guys had to believe in what we were doing, want to be a part of it and want it to succeed as much as I did."

With Pete Mathewson's help Rowe selected Russell Bennett from among the candidates for manager to become his assistant. Then he was on his own. Applying his own criteria, his intuition and lessons learned from a human relations course, Rowe interviewed between 40 to 50 applicants selected from UBF's survey. From these he chose ten.

THE PLANT OPENS

By January 1971, Wylie Centre Industries, Inc., was beginning to become a reality. Equipment was moved into the plant, and the men began work. "At first I pretty much had to run things," said Mathewson. "We began to set up the procedures for bookkeeping, inventory control, order entry, shipping and payroll. Every time we needed special help, I would pick up the telephone and call a specialist at Alcoa. The company was like a giant technical assistance organization standing by to lend a hand. They would send over a bookkeeper for a few days or an inventory control specialist. Then I would begin the procedure, such as making out payrolls, with Rowe watching. Then Rowe would pick up the responsibility. Now it has been passed on to Bennett, and I just check over the final result before I sign off as interim president. It was amazing how fast they caught on, how dedicated they have been to accuracy and detail, and how intelligent and aggressive they are."

The production employees received the same type of careful assistance when a man from Alcoa's Lancaster plant came to instruct the employees in proper working procedures and techniques in maintaining and using the machines. On-the-job training was emphasized, backed up by an hour and a half each week in the classroom.

In February, 1971, Wylie Centre Industries, Inc., produced its first nails and shortly after that began delivering nails to Alcoa. The men began to gain pride in their achievements. But each one donned a "We're competitive at Wylie" button to serve as a reminder of what they still had to achieve. "If I didn't believe in that button, I wouldn't wear it," said Tim Montgomery, a 25-year-old set-up man. "We're putting out a good product here. We're going to make it."

"Many of my friends find my job hard to believe," commented Tony Williams. "I have some responsibility on the job, and I'm proud of that. We want to make good and let everyone know we're successful here."

"We intend to make this a proft-conscious black company, one that will be a source of pride for the entire community," said Rowe. "A lot of the success will be attributed to the employees, who will be recognized not only as employees but also as individuals who will become involved in policy-making. Here the employee will be able to sense the real responsibilities by knowing that Wylie Centre's success is economically his own."

To build pride and interest in the company, Rowe has held a rap session with the production employees each month. After additional orders came in and production demands increased in June 1971, he met with them and asked them to put in a ten-hour day and six-day week to meet schedules. "They complied without a squawk," he said. "And generally there has been no problem of absenteeism or tardiness."

While the production men technically were still trainees until March 1972, they became proficient enough with the machines to develop new types of nails. One set-up man developed three new types for the special production order in June.

Rowe has lost only two men from his original ten. One decided to return to school full time, and a second "just wouldn't fit in," he said. "I tried to reach him. Sometimes he would produce, but at other times he wouldn't. He was just too far gone and was demoralizing the rest of the men. I had to let him go."

Alcoa representatives are generally enthusiastic about the progress of the company. "They are running at 130 percent of target," says Mathewson. "While originally I was to assist them for a maximum of two years, after six months I was needed only in an advisory capacity. They are running the operation almost entirely on their own."

Since October Rowe had doubled his shift. There are now 20 full-time plant employees, and more men will be hired as orders increase.

Although Wylie's market has expanded during the last year, "marketing is still our number one problem," says Rowe. "Since October, we have received two government contracts through competitive bidding totalling $30,000." In 1971 Alcoa was purchasing 100 percent of the nails. With increased production in 1972, 45 percent of the total production was marketed outside of Alcoa. However, Alcoa still purchased the same amount of nails. Rowe is now investigating the export markets, and has contacted a number of possible new buyers.

UBF leaders are also proud of the company's achievements. "This company has a real chance to survive and grow," said Jackson. "It was established on mutual respect. It has good equipment and is producing a good and needed product. Alcoa spent the time, money and effort to train its employees properly. I hope its success will encourage others to make the effort to establish this type of company." Wylie has now completely taken over the training of its new employees through an apprentice program. Classroom discussions are held once a week in the plant.

A SUPERETTE FOR THE GHETTO

At the same time the UBF was engaged in setting up the nail production plant, the organization was working with another business in organizing a badly needed food outlet for the Hill District. The food stores existing in the area after the riots consisted of a few single-owner markets that charged high prices, had little choice of merchandise and often were not sanitary, according to local residents.

After the riots of 1968 Mr. John F. Fox, president of Fox Grocery Company, became interested in helping the people of the ghetto and offered to assist UBF in establishing a food store that blacks could own and operate. UBF obtained a store building with funds donated by the Catholic diocese. Fox provided some of the equipment and trained a manager, a meat clerk, a produce man and an accountant. The training program has now been taken over by the University of Pittsburgh. During the first year Fox's company helped set up procedures and handled most of the bookkeeping.

A local organization, People to Aid Citizen's Enterprises (PACE), loaned money to UBF to purchase some of the inventory, and Fox asked each of his independently run chain stores, organized into Foodland Products, Inc., to donate additional money.

The Hill District store, called Community Mart, Inc., which opened early in August 1971, offered food—for the first time—to ghetto residents at prices competitive with large supermarkets. When food is put on sale at Foodland stores, the same products will go on sale at the Community Mart. In addition, eight more blacks have been drawn into the ownership and management of their community.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

The UBF is not stopping with its two successful achievements of founding a production plant and a food store, nor with its plans to acquire a small department store and a dry-cleaning establishment. It has already been the recipient of property donated by the United Jewish Federation; the UBF hopes to turn this into a research and training center for infants, from the cradle to three years of age.

Over 100 people have obtained jobs through referrals of UBF, based on the ARC employment survey. And as time and resources permit, more will be done to help ghetto residents in areas of social service.

As one Alcoa man said, "That group can show you what can be done when people have drive, determination and the desire to help themselves." The results are also indicative of what can be achieved when organizations from the private, public and industrial sectors pull together.

OMB-SUPPORTED POWERPLANT SITING TASK FORCE SHUNS ENVIRONMENTALISTS AND CONSUMERS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last January the Office of Management and Budget secretly established an interagency Federal task force to study delays allegedly caused by Federal agencies in the construction of powerplants and transmission lines, and to streamline Federal processes for approval of permits and licenses for bulk electric powerplants. The task force was established at the direction of the then Director of OMB, Caspar W. Weinberger, who cited "delays in the construction of powerplants" as one of the major problem areas of the so-called energy crisis.

The Interior Department's Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water Resources, Mr. William R. Wilson, in a February 22 memorandum to all Interior Assistant Secretaries, set forth the objectives of the task force as follows:

> The attached memorandum [of January 23, 1973] from Caspar Weinberger outlines *a high priority Administration effort* to resolve the problems at the Federal level associated with the delays in construction of power plants and bulk power transmission facilities. The Department of the Interior has been designated as the main focal point to expedite and coordinate all Federal reviews of applications for Federal authorizations necessary for the siting of electric generation and transmission facilities. The task group, under OMB chairmanship, is to review procedures and develop recommendations within 90 days *for Executive Order implementation*, including the possible formation within the Interior Department of an Electric Facilities Siting Panel under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior and comprised of the heads of all agencies having a major involvement in plant siting. (Italics added.)

Members of the task force group in addition to OMB and Interior, are the Federal Power Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Corps of Engineers. I understand that the Commerce Department has also been added to this task force.

There has been no public announcement of this task force by the administration.

On February 26, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS of California and I wrote to the present OMB Director, Mr. Roy L. Ash, and expressed concern that the administration did not inform the public about the establishment of this task force. We are concerned that the task force will develop its own report and recommendations, submit them to OMB, and then one fine day we will wake up to find that the President has issued an Executive order carrying out these recommendations without any opportunity for the public to comment on the report and recommendations before they are implemented.

Congressman Moss and I requested assurances from Mr. Ash that—

> The task force's report and all its recommendations will be made available to the public in sufficient time to review and comment on them prior to an "Executive order implementation" or any other action designed to carry out the recommendations.

We also said:

> In his January 23, 1973, memorandum, Mr. Weinberger specified that, in addition to obtaining agency views, the views of the utilities and manufacturers will also be solicited. It is unclear whether the views of State, municipal, and cooperative-owned utilities, as well as private utilities, will be solicited. Futhermore, there is no mention about soliciting the views of environmental and consumer groups.

At this stage we can only speculate that the task force recommendations—whatever they are—will adversely affect the public's consumer and environmental interests because, typically, the administration's task force, at OMB's direction, has excluded these interests in favor of the utilities and manufacturers.

Many of the problems that surface when Federal permits or licenses are considered in relation to powerplants and transmission lines result from the failure of the utilities to provide enough planning and review to the concerned Federal agencies at an early stage. The result is that the utilities panic and then start blaming environmentalists, citizens, and others, and the Federal agencies when they start to question the utilities' sacred plans and basic assumptions. Often those plans and assumptions prove quite faulty and, if adopted, would be detrimental to the public interest.

The administration should seek to avoid this by jawboning with the utilities and getting them to give the public a chance to review their plans even before they acquire lands and design their facilities. The administration should even require the utilities to prove their basic assumption that a new plant is needed and to show what energy conservation steps have been taken or are planned and what effect those steps will have on energy demand.

We have not yet received OMB's reply. The pertinent OMB-Interior memoranda and the full text of our letter to OMB follows:

JANUARY 16, 1973.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: Federal Processing of Power Plant Applications Meeting, January 11, 1973

1. Subject meeting was convened to explore issues and procedures which are subject to consideration should a task group be formed to streamline Federal processes relative to approval of permits and licenses for bulk electric power plants. (See attached list for attendees.)

2. The group agreed to the need for an effort to expedite Federal approval processes and to provide the basis for eliminating the risk of major Federal processing delays. Present timing is four to five years for fossil plants and nine to ten years for nuclear plants to come on line from design and order of equipment stage.

3. A number of steps in the flow were identified which deserved attention and treatment in any Federal-wide procedure. These included:

(a) timing; (b) sequencing; (c) concurrent review of substantive issues when more than one agency is involved; (d) provision for public notice; (e) focal point(s); and (f) identification of the Federal jurisdictional responsibilities and relationship among agencies.

4. FPC advocated inclusion of advance planning and review in the Federal review process to provide the utilities with a "go/no go" Federal position early in the planning process.

For example, many times today the Corps of Engineers gets into the act 18 months or less before the plant becomes operational. Early review and comment by the Corps may advise the utility that the waterway problem precludes siting in the selected area. This review by all concerned Federal agencies could save years of valuable planning time for another site. Accordingly, a mechanism for review and comment on planned power plant installation was agreed upon as a worthy objective of the task group.

5. Several comments indicated the desirability to include the Department of Justice in the review process in view of delays being encountered on anti-trust issues. Anti-trust issues may soon surpass the environmental problems in nuclear plants.

6. Summary:

(a) There was overwhelming support for articulated, organized, and expressed governmental procedures for processing power plant licenses and permits within the Federal establishment. This was agreed to whether or not legislation was passed.

(b) A task group should be organized as soon as practicable.

(c) In view of the need to include both short time power plant application processing and longer term planning review and comment, it may be desirable to develop a segmented approach to the task group effort unless it is feasible to develop a simple mechanism to respond to both considerations within a reasonably short period of time.

JACK J. SHARKEY,
Office of Management and Budget.

JANUARY 23, 1973.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION LIST

Subject: Streamlining Federal Power Plant Processes.

The energy problem of the Nation has been of increasing concern in the last few years. Many actions have been proposed to come to grips with one of the problem areas, delays in the construction of power plants.

Legislation has been proposed and is still being considered to deal with the specifics of power plant siting. Regardless of the outcome of the legislative proposals, it will be necessary to speed internal Federal processing procedures within and among agencies.

Accordingly, a task group is being established under OMB chairmanship to review procedures and develop recommendations for simplification, especially concerning the multiple agency involvement in plant siting. In view of their major roles in power plant siting, we are asking Interior, FPC, AEC, EPA, and the Corps of Engineers to provide full-time representatives on the task group for the next 60 to 90 days. We will call your office shortly with respect to the appropriate individual to represent your agency. Other agencies who are involved in power plant siting from the standpoint of licensing, permits, or other involvement are requested to furnish the name of an individual who can serve as a principal point of contact in their agency. Names of designees should be provided to Mr. Gordon Yamada (395-5156), Organization and Management Systems Division (OMB), by February 5, 1973. The views of the utilities and manufacturers will also be solicited.

Recognizing the serious power plant situation which faces the Nation, we believe it is important to select carefully responsible representatives for this task who can contribute from both a technical and management standpoint so the revised Federal processes will be clearly responsive to one of the Nation's most crucial needs.

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1973.

MEMORANDUM

To: All Assistant Secretaries.

From: William R. Wilson, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary—Water and Power Resources.

Subject: Streamlining Federal Power Plant Processes.

The attached memorandum from Caspar Weinberger outlines a high priority Administration effort to resolve the problems at the Federal level associated with the delays in construction of power plants and bulk power transmission facilities. The Department of the Interior has been designated as the main focal point to expedite and coordinate all Federal reviews of applications for Federal authorizations necessary for the siting of electric generation and transmission facilities. The task group, under OMB chairmanship, is to review procedures and develop recommendations within 90 days for Executive Order implementation, including the possible formation within the Interior Department of an Electric Facilities Siting Panel under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Interior and comprised of the heads of all agencies having a major involvement in plant siting.

Mr. James E. Van Reenen, Staff Assistant (Presidential Executive), has been assigned by Assistant Secretary Smith and Assistant Secretary Larson as the full-time representative of the Department in this task group effort. In view of the short time frame, please afford him your utmost cooperation and support in carrying out his assignment.

Also, please designate someone from your office to serve as a point of contact and source of input from your office to Mr. Van Reenen for this effort. Your designee should be familiar with the procedures within your office or agency for processing applications for rights-of-way permits, leases, and environmental impact statement reviews as they pertain to the siting of electric generation and transmisssion facilities.

Your designated representative is asked to attend meeting in the Secretary's Conference Room 5160 at 2:30 p.m. Friday, February 28, 1973, for the purpose of preparing a report to OMB by February 27, 1973, on our internal processing procedures.

REPORT OUTLINE ON ELECTRIC FACILITIES SITING APPROVAL AND PERMIT PROCEDURE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For each agency action related to siting and operation of power plants and related facilities per sample list (attached), provide the following:

A. FLOW CHART DEPICTING

1. Source of Action Request: a. Organizational level (Division/Branch, etc.); b. Location (Main, regional, or branch (field) office); c. Purpose of Action Request.

2. Each step in process required to complete action incluing special studies and mechanism for resolution of disputes.

3. Organizational Unit Conducting Process: a. Level (Division/Branch, etc.), and b. Location (Main, regional, or branch (field) office).

4. Minimum, normal, and maximum time required to complete each step of process.

5. Nature of Finished Product.

6. Recipient of Finished Product.

B. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Criteria for granting of permits, etc., or conduct of review.

2. Standard Forms.

3. Statutory and administrative bases for action.

4. Identification of problems associated with prompt processing and recommendations.

The deadlines for information are tight. We need hand drawn draft flow charts in Room 5617 (Main Interior Bldg) by noon on Tuesday, February 27. Supporting documents, as available, should be included with the flow chart and the remainder furnished by COB on Friday, March 2. Status report should reach us by COB March 30.

SAMPLES OF ACTIONS FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS REQUESTED

Land leases for plants, mining, etc.

Rights-of-way for transmission, water, fuel lines, etc.

Water service contracts.

Wheeling stipulations.

Mineral (coal) exploration permit.

Approval of State actions.

Environmental impact statement preparation.

Environmental impact statement reviews for other agencies.

Identify where involved in long-range planning for regional electricity supply.

Corps of Engineers dredge and fill permits.

EPA air and water discharge permits.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1973.

Mr. ROY L. ASH,
Director, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASH: We understand that last January the Office of Management and Budget established an interagency group to study delays allegedly caused by Federal agencies in the construction of power plants and transmission lines, and "to streamline Federal processes" for approval of permits and licenses for bulk electric power plants.

The Interior Department's Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water Resources, Mr. William R. Wilson, in a February 22, 1973, memorandum to all its Assistant Secretaries, commented on the objectives of the task force group as follows:

"The attached memorandum [of January 23, 1973] from Caspar Weinberger outlines *a high priority Administration effort* to resolve the problems at the Federal level associated with the delays in construction of power plants and bulk power transmission facilities. The Department of the Interior has been designated as the main focal point to expedite and coordinate all Federal reviews of applications for Federal authorizations necessary for the siting of electric generation and transmission facilities. The task group, under OMB chairmanship, is to review procedures and develop recommendations within 90 days *for Executive Order implementation*, including the possible formation within the Interior Department of an Electric Facilities Siting Panel under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior and comprised of the heads of all agencies having a major involvement in plant siting." (Emphasis supplied.)

We understand that the member agencies on the task force, besides OMB and Interior, are: the Federal Power Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Corps of Engineers.

We fail to understand why there was no public announcement of this task force by the Administration when it was established. Surely, such an announcement would have been in the public interest. We request your assurances that the task force's report and all its recommendations will be made available to the public in sufficient time to review and comment on them prior to any "Executive Order implementation."

In his January 23, 1973, memorandum, Mr. Weinberger specified that, in addition to obtaining agency views, the "views of the utilities and manufacturers will also be solicited." It is unclear whether the views of State, municipal, and cooperative-owned utilities, as well as private utilities, will be solicited. Furthermore, there is no mention about soliciting the views of environmental and consumer groups.

1. Please advise us whether the "views" of these groups will be sought.

2. (a) How will the views of the "utilities and manufacturers" (and others) be solicited?

(b) If it is to be done by means of oral presentation to the task force or others, will those meetings be open to the public?

(c) If it is to be done by written communication, will those communications be available to the public?

3. Please advise us whether the Department of Justice will be asked to participate in the study since, as noted in Mr. Jack J. Sharkey's January 16, 1973, Memorandum for the Record, "anti-trust issues," especially in relation to nuclear plants, "may soon surpass the environmental problems."

4. Please provide to us a list of power plant projects now being delayed by anti-trust issues.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.
JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

WHO WON THE WAR?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the most emotional statement made by any of our returning POW's was, "Who won the war?"

The POW, unable to get an answer to the question is quoted as having said:

I feel that it is going to be possibly five or ten years until I can make a decision (as to who won the war).

"Victory" has become so taboo that apparently Captain Pyle who had been a POW since 1966 was unaware that it has been deleted from the American vernacular. It was replaced by "peace-with-honor," "compromises" and "surrender." Our returning POW's will have to learn a completely new "vocabulary of defeat."

I think that the former POW knows who won the war.

I insert related newsclippings in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 6, 1973]

POW'S FIRST QUESTION: WHO WON THE WAR?

RIVERSIDE, CALIF.—A former prisoner of war says that since he was released from a Communist prison camp he has been trying to find out who won the Vietnam war.

Air Force Capt. Darrell Pyle, 32, said at a news conference yesterday that he walked aboard the U.S. freedom plane in Hanoi three weeks ago and immediately asked a crewman, "Who won the war?"

"'I don't know' was the crewman's terse reply," Pyle said.

Pyle, an F105 pilot who was shot down in 1966, said that he's been asking people ever since.

"I feel that it's going to be possibly five or 10 years until I can make a decision (as to who won the war)," said Pyle, whose family lives in Tustin, Calif.

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 7, 1973]

VIET CONG BID AT U.N. STIRS PROTEST

UNITED NATIONS.—The Viet Cong's request for permission to set up a liaison office for its Provisional Revolutionary Government at the United Nations has embarrassed the United States and brought protests from South Vietnam, diplomatic sources report.

The possibility was first discussed between PRG Foreign Minister Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, and Secretary General Kurt Waldheim at the 12-nation Paris peace conference. But it was made public without consulting the United States, which would have to issue visas to any Viet Cong representatives coming to a New York office. This the United States is not ready to do for the present, the sources said.

Agreeing to the full participation of the PRG in the Paris conference was about as far as the U.S. was willing to go, the sources indicated. The final solution for South Vietnam, they pointed out, was envisaged as a reconciliation and a coalition government. Any move to perpetuate the status of a second government would therefore not serve this purpose, they said.

Waldheim said he had the matter under study.

POSTAL SERVICE COMPLAINTS

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Monday, March 5, issue of Washington's Evening Star, because it gives a good description of the various kinds of complaints we are all receiving these days about poor postal service. The volume of complaints to congressional offices is increasing and the constituents are insisting that Congress reassert its responsibility in this area.

The article follows:

THE MAIL HANGUP

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Tradition says it can't be snow or rain or heat or gloom of night. But something certainly is slowing the mail.

That's what Care, the international relief organization, found when it tried to rush into the mail a postcard appeal for funds to aid victims of Nicaragua's Christmas earthquake. Eight carloads of mail, including the Care cards, got mislaid for nine days. By the time they were located, the earthquake was no longer big news and the response—or lack of response—showed it. The U.S. Postal Service is still trying to find out what happened.

A Vienna, Va., husband also discovered the snail's pace of the mail when he sent a Valentine one mile to his wife. When his loving message hadn't arrived a week later, his wife was sure he'd forgotten her.

And the Alexandria Board of Trade, found the same thing when local businessmen each noted the postmark and delivery dates on 100 pieces of mail. Among other things, the poll showed that only a fifth of the mail from the District reached Alexandria Post Office boxes the next day.

Businessmen all over are complaining bitterly about delayed mail, about sales that are over before notices of the sale reach customers. Lawyers complain that documents mailed to courts across the country miss filing deadlines. Book and record clubs have had to extend deadlines for customers to say whether they want or don't want that month's selection.

Commented John Jay Daly, vice president of the Direct Mail Advertising Association, Inc., "I used to say it can't get much worse. I've stopped saying that."

Almost everybody using the mails has his own little crisis to report—an interest charge added to a store account or utility bill because the payment was delayed in the mail, overdrafts at the bank because mailed deposits didn't arrive in time, extension course examinations that had to be done over again because the test papers went astray in the mail.

Then, of course, there are the party invitations that arrive after the party and perishable gifts that went bad in the mail.

The Postal Service acknowledges complaints have reached a record high. Complaints after Christmas about delayed first class mail, for example, were up 30 percent over last year. Several congressmen, irate about their own a well as their constituents' mail, have introduced legislation to return the postal service to its old status where Congress played much more of a role in running the show. A Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee investigation of mail service gets underway Wednesday with Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen as the opening witness. A House probe is expected to follow.

What is wrong?

The Star-News, investigating on its own, found some knowledgeable people completely convinced that the policy of the Postal Service is to slow down the mail to reduce costs—a charge postal officials flatly deny.

MISMANAGEMENT CHARGED

Senior Asst. Postmaster Gen. Murray Comarow, who heads customer services, admitted in an interview, however, "We probably did go too far in our effort to save money."

"We're determined to get service back," said Comarow "but in a way to help us stay within reach of people's pocketbooks. If we say to hell with costs to give good services, people will have to look for 45-cent stamps. Part of our obligation is the price we're asking them to pay."

Much of the criticism focuses on charges of various forms of mismanagement from Washington by people operating more on theory than experience.

Veteran postal officials—most of them out of the service by now—contend the score of new officials brought in to run the service try to move the mail as they move cans and spark plugs down the assembly line rather than thinking in terms of public service.

Here's what The Star-News investigation pinpointed as the key reasons for the mail slow-down:

The postmaster general didn't know how bad the mail service was becoming because his officials supplied him with discredited figures. So it wasn't until January that Klassen publicly admitted he wasn't satisfied with the way the mail was moving and not until February that he called in his district managers to get their ideas on what was wrong. Plenty, they said.

A job freeze beginning last March kept postmasters from filling vacancies—even at new installations like Merrifield, Va., the facility serving all Northern Virginia. Overstaffed and understaffed operations were treated alike. Nationwide results: Employees worked overtime until exhausted or postmasters tried to save overtime by leaving mail sacks untouched.

Two offers of early retirement stripped headquarters and regional offices of ranking officials and then robbed post offices throughout the country of their experienced, knowledgeable men. More than a quarter of the supervisors departed and the service showed it.

Morale is said by union officials to be the lowest in the history of the postal service. Senate investigators preparing for hearings also are finding unhappy postal workers wherever they go. Some rank-and-file postal workers were demanding a congressional investigation before it was announced and in some cities they have publicly apologized for the poor service customers are getting.

The postal service is mechanizing to save labor costs. To justify the expense of the machines, mail that used to be processed where it originated now has been going to state distribution centers where the concentration of mail slows down the service sometimes for days at a time. Again, Comarow told The Star-News, the service went too far in some areas.

The number of "chiefs" grows while the number of "Indians" actually getting the mail from here to there declines.

FORCE DECLINING

Rep. H. R. Gross, R-Iowa, ranking Republican on the House Post Office Committee, noted this week that besides the postmaster general at $60,000 a year, 20 postal officials are now making $42,000 a year or more—a total which he says equals the number authorized at that level for the entire federal executive branch.

Before the Post Office Department became the Postal Service on July 1, 1971, the postmaster general had eight assistant postmasters general. Now he's aided by five senior assistant postmasters general and 17 assistant postmasters general. He's supposed to have a deputy postmaster general, too, but that job is vacant.

Meanwhile, the postal force declined from 741,216 at the start of the Post Office Department's last year to 706,400 at the end of one year of the Postal Service. By February 1973, the force was down to 677,746 and the fiscal 1974 budget estimates a postal force of 634,707.

As the number of men collecting, sorting and delivering the mail declines, the amount of mail being handled continues to climb. Before postal reorganization, the postal force handled 84.8 billion pieces of mail in 1970. Last year 87.1 billion pieces of mail were handled and the Postal Service forecasts that by 1977 the mail will have climbed to 97.9 billion pieces a year.

That is the prospect facing the Postal Service as it tries to break even. Some observers in and out of the Postal Service contend the current effort to try to break even has become an obsession with the Postal Service's businessmen.

With reorganization, changing the Post Office from a Cabinet department into a quasi-public corporation, Congress wanted the Postal Service to become self-supporting by 1984. Postal officials are trying to accomplish that sooner.

REDUCING COSTS

It was this obsession, they claim, that led to dwindling manpower and sagging morale.

Comarow, who worked on postal reorganization before becoming head of the customer service group, views cost cutting from a different angle.

While admitting the Postal Service went too far in trying to reduce costs, he says: "We felt it was an extremely useful exercise for district managers, most of whom were not accustomed to thinking in terms of running an efficient, cost-conscious, service-oriented operation."

All the problems besetting postal facilities across the country—the job freeze, the early retirement of key employes, the drive to mechanize—are reflected locally. Problems were intensified because Merrifield couldn't hire the help it needed to cope with its growing volume.

And Washington got a unique problem when a 10 p.m. curfew on plane departures was imposed. That meant mail had to be collected and processed sooner if it was to leave town that night.

Despite the problems, 98 percent of the first class mail within the Washington area was being delivered overnight during October and November. That amounted to about 50 percent of the 18 to 20 million pieces of mail daily in the Washington postal area (extending from Calvert County, Md., to Prince William County, Va.)

Then came the Christmas rush and employes already exhausted by constant overtime faced a mountain of mail being shuttled to sectional centers. So for the entire area, overnight mail service dropped to 81 percent.

In Washington itself, where mail was processed at the downtown postal facility, 92 percent was still getting overnight delivery. But only 55 percent of the Maryland mail being processed at the Riverdale center was being delivered the next day and only 44 percent of the Northern Virginia mail being processed at Merrifield was getting overnight delivery.

WORSE, THEN BETTER

Then it got worse. In the period from Dec. 23, to Jan. 5—with holiday mail up 30 percent over last year—only 69 percent of the area mail was being processed and delivered overnight. Washington dropped to 73 percent, the Riverdale facility managed to climb to 87 percent but overnight delivery of Northern Virginia mail dropped to 39 percent.

By mid-January, the average overnight delivery in the area was back to 82 percent. Both the District and the Riverdale facility were processing 90 percent of their mail overnight but Merrifield was only back to 56 percent.

Entering February, area mail was being processed overnight 92 percent of the time. The District was back to 98 percent, Riverdale to 93 percent and even Merrifield—with long requested people now being recruited—was up to delivering 80 percent of Northern Virginia mail overnight.

It was during that period that the Alexandria Board of Trade tabulation showed that only 20.9 percent of mail from the District, 45.5 percent of mail from northern Virginia, 21.1 percent of the mail from Alexandria itself and only 16 percent of mail from Maryland reached mail boxes in the Alexandria Post Office the day after the letter was mailed.

The latest postal figures covering the period from Feb. 3 to 16, show the area is edging closer to overnight mail service for first class mail staying within the area. Thus, the area as a whole showed 95 percent of the mail was delivered overnight. The District was back to 97 percent; Riverdale, 93 percent and Merrifield, 94 percent.

Partly these figures indicate that the Postal Service here has recovered from the Christmas and post-Christmas crunch. But it also means that in the Washington area, as in some other parts of the country, postal officials are trying to get mail where it's supposed to go more expeditiously—even if it means bypassing fancy machinery.

Klassen himself is expected to approve changes in the highly touted "managed mail" concept where all the mail coming into a state was massed at a state distribution center from which it would fan out to sectional centers around the state. The concentration of too much mail at places which already faced a crunch has been widely blamed for delays. Some district managers, including Carleton Beall, the district manager here, are sending mail from its origin direct to its destination without dumping all the mail at overcrowded state distribution centers.

CONFIDENCE DWINDLED

Beall and the others, with at least an implied blessing from Klassen, are hoping that in return they will get less mail that the facility at the other end of the line should have processed. This means that mail will reach people a day or more sooner, that priority mail really will have priority and improper massing of the mail can be pinpointed.

In the harsh reality of the Christmas snare, more than one area of overconfidence in the postal high command dwindled.

Months earlier, however, it became apparent that Klassen's men were giving him figures that made the mail service look better than it was—especially the air mail service.

As a result, Klassen told a meeting of postal supervisors Aug. 7: "Today we are providing overnight delivery on 95 percent of air mail between 14,000 pairs of cities." What Klassen presumably did not know was that the Postal Service's Origin-Destination Information service (ODIS) was checking a million pieces of live mail every two weeks and reporting 73 percent, not 95 percent, overnight air mail delivery.

Klassen's air mail figures were based on test letters which both the Postal Inspection

Services and the General Accounting Office have discredited because postal employees recognize the markings on test letters and rush them through. Test letters have now been abandoned.

The public also had reason to be skeptical of Klassen's figures when he announced on Jan. 4—in the midst of the post-Christmas mail debacle—that 94 percent of the first class mail deposited by 5 p.m. and destined for local delivery was being delivered the next day.

At the time of his announcement, ODIS statistics showed that for the period from Dec. 9 to Jan. 5, only 70 percent of the mail in designated next-day service areas was actually delivered next day.

Although Klassen was talking in the present tense, most of his statement dealt with accomplishments in the first year of the Postal Service.

Overnight service in metropolitan areas climbed back to 90 percent between Jan. 6 to Feb. 2. But that didn't compare favorably with 93 percent overnight service for the same period last year.

Since each percentage point represents almost 20 million pieces of first class mail, the drop from last year means that 60 million fewer letters were reaching their destination the next day compared with last year.

Why did the service slow down? Why didn't it improve after Christmas as it did last year? Why are the third class mailers—the only class of mailers paying their way—reporting that their mail is taking as much as 40 days to get delivered?

Many explanations are being given—two days of mourning following two holiday weekends, exhausted employes, postmasters trying to stay within rigid budgets, the new mechanized systems bogging down under the weight of Christmas mail and failing to bounce back.

The explanation that's not being offered at postal headquarters but crops up here and there around the country is that sacks, even truckloads of Christmas mail were "hidden" and stayed "hidden" until after New Year's Day.

UNTOUCHED MAIL

A perfect example of mail build-up, mail hiding, mail shuffling occurred at Charleston, W. Va., practically under the eyes of John Giannini, chief investigator of the Senate Post Office Committee and a former postal official. Biannini was sent by Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., and his findings prompted Randolph to plug successfully for a full-scale investigation.

Giannini discovered 3,475 sacks of mail untouched in the Charleston post office, which had suffered a $900,000 budget cut and simply didn't have enough people to process the mail.

When Randolph asked for an explanation, 900 sacks of the mail were rushed to post offices in Parkersburg and Wheeling, W. Va., for distribution. However, they did not have enough transport facilities to cover the whole state so they took out the mail for their areas and sent the rest back to Charleston.

Charleston also sent sacks to small third-class offices which put up temporary distribution cases but since they didn't have enough slots to distribute mail to every West Virginia city, that mail too had to go back to Charleston.

TRAINEE IN CHARGE

Randolph found out that the officer in charge at Charleston was a 27-year-old management trainee with no supervisory experience. He reportedly added his mite to the morale problem when he told the press that untouched mail sacks were shuffled to other offices because employes were supposed to work eight hours a day and this gave them something to do.

Postal officials are now aware that what happened in Charleston was no isolated case. If they didn't already know, 85 district managers brought in from all over the country wised them up.

Where do they go from nere? H. F. Faught, senior assistant postmaster general for mail processing, sounds optimistic.

"We believe we can handle the mail more swiftly than in the past with the present system," he said. "Good service is not going to wait for a lot of new machines. It can be provided with the present machines. It's true that machines can be more efficient and reduce costs but we believe we can provide good service at the present time."

NIGHT FLIGHTS CURBED

He noted that the Postal Service is trying to cope with airlines' cancellation of 900 late-night flights. The postal service now has 160 air taxis, including six jets, operating every night.

On the ground, he reported that development of a machine to handle, read and sort preferential mail is now completed. The prototype at Cincinnati sends 400,000 letters a day through a fully mechanized letter handling program.

He expects full mechanization of the postal operation will cost about $5 billion over six years.

And he thinks costs can be lowered and service improved at the same time. He acknowledges there have been some significant problems but he says a number of problems have been corrected and "we think it's going to be a matter of continuous improvement."

"When we get the system working," he said, "it'll smooth out. It's got to."

What about day-to-day service? Frank M. Sommerkamp, assistant postmaster general for delivery service, says no more cuts in service are planned.

SATURDAY DELIVERIES

At one time, all postal boxes got collections after 5 p.m. Now, only 50 percent of them are collected after 5 p.m.

"The more you hit, the more time it takes and the problem is to get the mail downtown and processed in time to make flights," he explained.

Saturday mail deliveries will be continued except in downtown business areas where businessmen are asked if they still want Saturday service to closed offices.

In the suburbs, more mail will be delivered to curb line boxes by mail men operating right-hand drive vehicles. Over 90,000 routes have been motorized and the number is increasing.

"We're not really reducing service," Sommerkamp said, "but we're trying to hold increases to a minimum because every year over a million and a half additional deliveries have to be made."

Sommerkamp is one of the few top executives held over from the old regime. Asked what he thinks of the way things are going, he replied: "I was in favor of reorganization before the law was passed and I'm in favor of it now. It's a big complex business. I still think service should come first, but we should use businesslike methods of providing it. We went through adjustment this year. When you try to tighten up on waste, you're going to have problems."

NO 1973 INCREASE

The only thing people didn't have to complain about so far this year is a rise in the cost of a first-class postage stamp. The threatened nine-cent postage stamp in January didn't materialize.

However, labor contracts for 600,000 postal employees run out in July. Klassen says if labor costs go up, postage rates will go up, too. But not this year.

To some extent, the future will be shaped by what happens at the upcoming congressional hearings.

Says Gross: "The public is not going to tolerate the deterioration of service and Congress is going to have to get back in the business of real oversight of postal operations."

One wit already has a suggestion for next year's Christmas stamp:

"O Lord, deliver me."

CONGRESSMAN BENNETT INTRODUCES THE FEDERAL ACT TO CONTROL EXPENDITURES AND UPGRADE PRIORITIES

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, the Federal Act to Control Expenditures and Upgrade Priorities. This legislation is similar to legislation introduced by Senator BROCK. I believe the attached article by Senator BROCK, which appeared in "Nation's Business", December 1972, points out the pressing need for this legislation. The article reads as follows:

A PLAN TO MAKE FEDERAL BUDGETING MAKE SENSE

(By Senator WILLIAM E. BROCK III)

Picture, if you can, a corporation with 500 men on its board of directors.

If that doesn't tax your credulity, try this. For reasons of its own, the board can't—or won't—pass on the corporation's overall annual budget.

Instead, it farms out small parts of the budget to scores of subcommittees, each riding herd on an office or two.

They hold hearings that go on for months, as one executive after another comes forward to sell his office's spending plans.

Some executives go beyond personal appeals.

They coax stockholders to appear before the subcommittees to plug the executives' pet projects.

Finally, often after the new fiscal year has begun, about 20 separate budget reports—or mini-budgets—go before the board. Most members have only a foggy notion of what's in a report or behind it. Only the handful who held hearings, and drafted it, know that.

So the board tends to go along with the spending plans those colleagues have endorsed.

Thus, bit by bit, the overall budget takes shape.

Meanwhile, no board member knows how much it will add up to. Nor does the board weigh the relative merits of competing demands on corporate funds. It's an open-ended way to draft a budget.

We all know what would happen under a system like this. The board members would soon spend the corporation into bankruptcy.

I ask, is that any way to run a railroad—or any other enterprise?

Well, that's the way Congress runs the country.

Almost every business, or municipality, adopts a budget before it starts spending money for the coming year.

But not the federal government.

To be sure, the President proposes a budget. But at no time does Congress accept it completely nor does Congress adopt a budget of its own.

HODGEPODGE ON THE HILL

Instead, the system works like this:

Each January, the President sends his budget to Congress, asking it to approve specific spending programs and to provide money for them in appropriations bills.

Since there are thousands of federal spending programs, each bill includes funds for a number of them.

Once introduced, the bills are sent to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. There the various parts are referred to subcommittees.

The House Committee, for example, has 13 subcommittees. There are subcommittees for agriculture, and environmental and consumer protection; for housing and urban development, space and science; for labor, health, education and welfare; for the Treasury, Post Office, and general government—plus others.

In theory, the full Committee controls these appropriations bills. In practice, the subcommittees have almost complete say-so in their own spheres.

For one thing, they become experts in their specialized fields. So members of one subcommittee tend not to challenge the decisions of the others.

When the subcommittees have finished, their recommendations are lumped together in an overall appropriations bill.

Obviously, this catch-all measure may or may not reflect the judgment of the full Committee. It represents a collection of decisions delegated to a lower level.

Sound like a weird way to run our biggest institution—the federal government?

Well, there's more.

FALSE CEILINGS

Before voting any money, the Appropriations Committees usually wait for a green light from other policymaking committees of Congress.

Each house has about 20 of them, with numerous subcommittees. They set an authorization, or spending ceiling, on all programs, new and old.

Sometimes these ceilings are quite misleading.

They may be set high in full knowledge that far less money will actually be appropriated. In this way, Congressmen can make what seem to be lavish, multibillion-dollar promises, with the comforting knowledge that they won't be kept.

Or they may grossly understate full costs by setting only short-term ceilings on long-range projects. In this way, Congressmen can let a pet program get its foot in the door—apparently dirt cheap.

Only later do taxpayers find that, over the years, costs skyrocket. Medicaid is a good recent example.

So much for spending.

Now for raising the money to pay for it.

The committees that spend have nothing to do with paying the tab.

That's the job of two other committees—the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. They write the tax laws, change the rules, raise the rates or lower them.

At no point does any Congressional body say: "Here's how much we want to spend. Here's what it's for. Here's how we'll get the money to pay for it."

Or, better still: "Here's all that we have to spend. And here's how we'll stretch it to cover our priority needs."

Unfortunately, a long time ago, Congress let the ultimate authority for fiscal responsibility gravitate to the White House.

Today, the only place where a budget is put together is in the Office of Management and Budget in the Executive Office of the President.

About all Congress does is look at the priorities set by OMB and add or subtract a few items.

A LACK OF MACHINERY

Congress lacks the machinery to arrive at its own priorities.

All too often, it increases a budget rather than prune it. For example, in the last session, its impact on the President's budget was to increase the deficit by some $9 billion before Presidential vetoes whittled that down to $5.76 billion.

Under this system, quite predictably, efforts to control federal spending have flopped. Here's how the federal budget has climbed in the past few fiscal years:

From 1968 to 1969, up nearly $6 billion.

From 1969 to 1970, $12 billion.

From 1970 to 1971, nearly $15 billion.

From 1971 to 1972, more than $20 billion.

It's estimated that from 1972 to 1973, the rise will be as much as $25 billion.

The red ink on our balance sheet presents an even more dismal picture. Federal deficits from fiscal 1970 through 1973 will total an estimated $84 billion—or approaching one fifth of our national debt.

Nor is the future any brighter. A recent American Enterprise Institute study estimates these deficits, even on a so-called "full employment" basis, at $5 billion in 1973; $14 billion in 1974; $22 billion in 1975.

It's quite apparent that growing federal spending has brought us to a crisis stage. This fiscal crisis affects every American.

Over 10 per cent of the average family's taxes go to pay the interest on our national debt—which is approaching $500 billion.

And the country is embarking on a new spending spree—for so-called social needs. Washington has an ingrained belief that if anything is wrong, anywhere, the cure is to throw money at it.

This year, federal spending on education, manpower, health, housing, civil rights and other social programs will add up to $122 billion. That's about half of Washington's total expenditures.

A FRESH APPROACH

It's time to try a fresh approach. We can't provide essential social needs within an expanding economy without a sound budgetary process.

What is needed is thorough reform of the way in which Congress handles spending and tax measures.

To meet this crisis, I will reintroduce a bill I submitted at the last session: the Federal Act to Control Expenditures and Upgrade Priorities.

If passed, it would require not only Congress as a body, but each individual member, to face up to his duty to curb spending. My bill contains five points:

It would amend the House and Senate rules to create a Joint Committee on the Budget.

This Committee would develop a legislative budget—as opposed to an executive budget—providing a way to establish priorities and control expenditures.

It would require five-year budget projections for every major category of federal spending.

This would compel Congress and the Executive branch to acknowledge fully the long-range costs of spending programs. All too often, in the years after they've passed Congress, federal programs' costs have ballooned. It is no longer acceptable to evaluate project spending on a one-year basis, as in the past.

It would require reevaluation of spending programs every three years.

The purpose of this is to ensure periodic Congressional review of all important federal programs. The trend today is to add new programs without even attempting to do away with those that are outmoded and useless. As a result, the government gets bigger and bigger and bigger.

It would require consideration of at least two years' pilot testing of every proposed major program.

This would provide Congress, and the country, with a better estimate of the costs and benefits of new federal projects. No prudent businessman would promote a new product nationwide without some preliminary market testing. I feel government should use the same prudent approach with tax dollars.

Money for all federal spending, including that of the trust funds, would have to be appropriated annually by Congress.

At present, more than 800 of these federal trust funds are not subject to this kind of annual review by Congress.

Instead, they have a permanent spending authority. This spending adds to our huge federal deficits and should be subject to some review and discipline.

HOW MANY—AND HOW MUCH?

The government has lost its sense of purpose in developing federal programs. New ones are hastily concocted with little or no knowledge of what's already in existence. Duplication is the order of the day.

Let's take just one example.

Today, we have more than 1,050 federal domestic assistance programs.

Many overlap. This makes it almost impossible to find out how many people are getting aid—and how much. It also leads to a great deal of waste and inefficiency.

Making matters worse, it's hard to determine what good the program is doing, if any.

The five-point plan I have outlined will bring about long-needed reform in the budgetary process if passed by Congress.

It permits Congressional control over federal spending and, at the same time, a constant review and upgrading of national priorities.

If Congress does not put an end to the spending spree, we face two alternatives: Taxes will go up—or a new surge of inflation will boost prices even higher.

Neither is acceptable to me, nor tolerable to an already overburdened free society.

HISTORIC JOHN BEATTIE QUARRY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have received an informative article written by Mrs. Patricia Cochrane of my district concerning the vast quantity of quality granite obtained from the John Beattie Quarry on Leete's Island in Connecticut for use in such historic monuments as the Statue of Liberty. I would like to take this opportunity to include a summary of this material as follows:

The unusual pink and black-veined stone found in the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty is a product of a fine quarry on Leete's Island, in the State of Connecticut. The excellence of this stone remained unappreciated until after the Civil War when John Beattie recognized its value and purchased a few acres in 1869, and enlarged his claim to 400 more acres within a few weeks. Now it is recognized as a very durable stone—actually second hardest in the country—yet, despite its durability, takes on the fine polish of marble.

The contract for the statue's pedestal was arranged in 1882, and 400 workmen were hired from all over the world to blast the stone with black powder, in order that the contract deadline of 1884 be met. Pulled by oxen and sled to Hoadley Point, the cargo was then carried by the schooners *Wasp I* and *Wasp II* into Long Island through Hell's Point. The unshifting cargo—the four heaviest stones weighed 28 tons each—and the strong current made it necessary to scrap these ships at the end of their journey. When the cargo reached Bedloe's Island, a small community was set up to accommodate the workmen and their families nearby in Guildford.

John Beattie did well with his investment, making over $70,000 on this one contract. Other sites which were to use this granite were the Brooklyn Bridge, Newport News Grain Elevator in Virginia, Battery Wharf in New York City, bridges on the Harlem Railroad, and the Smithsonian Institution. The quarry is no longer in operation, and most of the land has been sold for individual homesites. Only the small piece of land bought by Yale University and containing John Beattie's home indicates anything of the activity that must have existed there during the 19th century.

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION COUNCIL: IN SERVICE TO OUR NATION SINCE 1934

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the California Conservation Council noting that this is California Conservation Week. The Council, one of the oldest conservation organizations in California, was organized in 1934. Its members have worked to promote conservation through education and cooperation. Following is the letter describing the activities and goals of the Council.

MARCH 2, 1973.

Hon. GEORGE DANIELSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIELSON: The California Conservation Council wishes to express deep appreciation for your interest and dedication to conservation. We appreciate your assistance in bringing Conservation Week observance to public attention.

Annual observance of Conservation Week, March 7–14 is sponsored by the California Conservation Council. The Council has placed educational materials in the hands of 9,000 schools this year. On March 5 the Council will sponsor a Conservation Education Banquet in Sacramento honoring Governor and Mrs. Ronald Reagan, Resources Agency Secretary Norman B. Livermore, Jr., and Wilson Riles, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The ten top projects entered by California High Schools in the Presidential and California State Environmental Award Program will be given special plaques.

The California Conservation Council is one of the oldest conservation organizations in California. It was organized in 1934 to promote conservation of natural resources through education and to encourage cooperation in conservation effort. The Council is a non-profit corporation supported by voluntary contributions. It's membership is composed of educators, officials of governmental departments, industrial representation and concerned citizens.

The key role of the Council has been to identify needs and seek out those best qualified to affect a solution. The Council places particular stress on efforts to create a sound, rational basis for intelligent environmental decisions. A major thrust has been to furnish broad guaged and accurate information to educators. In this they have the benefit of counsel from outstanding Advisors for Cooperation who head both federal and state resource agencies or educational institutions. The Council sponsors conferences, worshops, publications and scholarships. We continually seek new areas of service to mankind.

Thank you again for your interest in promoting conservation.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. B. ATKISSON,
Executive Secretary.

DENY BAIL TO HARD DRUG PUSHER

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, the Sentinel Star, an outstanding daily newspaper in my congressional district in Orlando, Fla., showed its awareness of the mounting heroin epidemic on March 5, with an editorial urging Congress to consider denial of bond to drug pushers awaiting trial.

The article follows:

DENYING BAIL TO HARD DRUG PUSHER WAY TO KEEP A BAD MAN DOWN

In considering ways to crack down on the dealers in heroin and other hard drugs, Congress should not overlook legislation that would permit judges to hold indicted drug law violators without bond pending their trials and appeals.

Recent court rulings have made it all but impossible to hold a defendant for trial without bond, even in the most serious cases, without specific statutory authority. Congress should provide that authority.

There is a question whether any individual caught selling addictive drugs should be at liberty anyway unless and until his innocence is established. Experience has shown that time and again the dealing continues—and sometimes further arrests are made—while a drug defendant is free on bond awaiting trial.

Besides the question of public safety, however, there is the psychology of a swift and certain stay in jail for anybody picked up dealing in drugs.

A potential pusher is often willing to take his chances with the law if he knows he can be free on bond pending not only his trial but several appeals dragging out months and sometimes years.

The chance of his actually going to prison diminishes with every day he's able to stay outside bars. Witnesses disappear and die and if his lawyer is sharp enough to wangle a new trial, the defendant figures he's home free, and often he is.

A specific law permitting judges to withhold bond in specified cases would make it a new ball game.

Under present law and prevailing judicial practices the criminal is taking a calculated risk on (1) not getting caught and (2) if caught remaining free on bond as long as his lawyer is able to stall and appeal.

Would the pusher take the same chance if he knew he'd be in jail while all this legal maneuvering is going on?

We think fewer of them would.

It is possible that the denial of bail would be a greater deterrent than the longer prison terms also being proposed.

STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1973

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to stop the President from unilaterally dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity and to provide Congress with the opportunity to evaluate its performance. This legislation will give us the time to decide whether to continue OEO as presently constituted or to devise an alternative strategy for dealing with the problems of the poor. The bill suspends, for a period of 1 year from the date of enactment, the authority of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to delegate any of his powers under section 602(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Whatever our feelings are respecting the Office of Economic Opportunity—and certainly we may disagree among ourselves about the relative merit of various OEO programs—the issue that we must recognize today is that we are in the depths of a constitutional struggle centering upon the prerogatives of Congress versus those of the President. Our every action must be evaluated in that context. Before we pass judgment on the utility of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the substance of the President's arguments for destroying it, we should first deal with the question of who has the final authority to end this congressionally mandated program—Congress or the President.

The President's announced plans to transfer and abolish all programs administered under the Economic Opportunity Act without the consent of Congress are based upon the broad and ambiguous grant of authority in section 602(d) of the act. Although the President's plans and the Acting Director's actions to date constitute an executive reorganization within the meaning of section 903 of the Executive Reorganization Act of 1949, the President has not transmitted a reorganization plan to Congress and all indications are that, in the absence of clarifying language in the Economic Opportunity Act, he will not do so in the future. According to a legal memorandum prepared by the Acting General Counsel of OEO, the administration does not believe that a reorganization plan is required by law.

The bill I am introducing, while temporarily suspending the Director's authority under section 602(d), also requires that the President submit a reorganization plan to Congress if he wishes to delegate any powers, functions, or programs provided for the Office of Economic Opportunity under the act. This provision is necessary in order to clarify any ambiguity in section 602(d) that would lead to an interpretation that this section provides the Director with the authority to destroy OEO. The effect of this provision would be to put the President on notice that Congress in-tends to play a role in any significant changes made in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Congress, on previous occasions, has similarly limited the authority of the Director under section 602(d). In 1969, Congress amended the Economic Opportunity Act to provide that the Director shall not delegate the legal services program. In 1972, Congress further amended the act to provide that the Director shall not delegate his functions under the community action and community economic development programs. In addition, Congress provided that the Director reserve and make available not less than $328.9 million for community action and $71.5 million for legal services and extended the duration of all programs administered under the act through fiscal year 1975. Congress, in passing these amendments, clearly recognized the need to insulate important programs from being delegated away from the Office of Economic Opportunity. These amendments not only indicate that Congress intended these programs to continue to exist until it decided otherwise, but also that OEO would remain a viable administrative vehicle for them.

As we are all aware, the President's plans include the transfer and abolition of all programs administered under the Economic Opportunity Act, rendering OEO an empty shell—A statutory entity without powers or functions. In addition, the President's plan provides for the termination of all Federal assistance to community action agencies, leaving their continued existence to the discretion of local communities. Clearly, Congress, in enacting the 1969 and 1972 amendments, intended to prevent exactly this type of unilateral action by the President.

It must be emphasized that the intent of this bill is not to prevent the President from reorganizing the Executive Office or to prevent him from implementing plans to more effectively fight the war on poverty. This bill only requires that the President consult Congress in the process by observing the law as set down in the Executive Reorganization Act and the various provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act.

For the benefit of those Members who would like to have the opportunity to cosponsor this legislation, the bill will be reintroduced next week.

I include the text of the proposed legislation and a section-by-section synopsis in the RECORD at this point:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SYNOPSIS OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1973

Section 1. Prohibits the impoundment of funds appropriated by Congress for economic opportunity programs and exempts the Office of Economic Opportunity from the provisions of the Federal Anti-deficiency Act;

Section 2. Provided that the Director shall provide financial assistance to Community Action Programs;

Section 3. Provides that the Director shall develop special programs under section 222(a) of the Act;

Section 4. Provides that a vacancy occurring in the Office of the Director may be filled temporarily for not more than 30 days in conformity with title 5, United States Code, section 3348;

Section 5. Suspends for one year the Director's authority to delegate any of his powers or functions, or programs administered under this Act unless he complies with the terms of the Executive Reorganization Act. This will provide Congress with the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This provision does not affect delegations made under section 602(d) prior to January 31, 1973. However, any delegations made after this date not in compliance with this amendment are to be returned to the Office of Economic Opportunity;

Section 6. Prohibits the Director from disposing of property belonging to the Office of Economic Opportunity that would have the effect of reducing the Office's powers, functions or programs.

Section 7. Provides that the Director shall not transfer funds to other Federal agenices for the performance of Office of Economic Opportunity functions delegated after January 31, 1973, if the President has not complied with the requirements of the Executive Reorganization Act as provided in section 5 above. This section also provides, that any unexpended funds so transferred prior to January 31, 1973, not in compliance with this provision, be returned to the Office of Economic Opportunity;

Section 8. Provides procedures for a full and fair hearing before financial assistance may be suspended under any title of the Act.

Cosponsors

Mr. Conyers (for himself, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Frank Thompson, Mr. Moakley, Mr. Won Pat, Ms. Schroeder, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Bolling, Mr. Burton, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. de Lugo, Mr. Owens, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Metcalfe, Mr. Parren Mitchell, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Hicks).

Mr. Conyers (for himself, Mr. Fraser, Ms. Holtzman, Mr. Fred Rooney, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Stark, Mr. Riegle, Ms. Abzug, Mr. Andrew Young, Ms. Mink, Mr. Mendel Davis, Mr. Paul McCloskey, Ms. Burke of California, Mr. Seiberling, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Helstoski).

H.R. 5398

A bill to amend title 42 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to require that any plans to reorganize the Office of Economic Opportunity be transmitted to Congress pursuant to the Executive Reorganization Act, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1973".

PROHIBITION OF IMPOUNDMENT OF APPORTIONMENTS AND DIVERSION OF FUNDS

SEC. 1 (a) The Congress directs that no part of any sums which have been apportioned pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be impounded or withheld from the purposes for which appropriated by any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

(b) No funds authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be expended by or on behalf of any Federal department, agency or instrumentality other than the Office of Economic Opportunity, except (1) as may be provided by Reorganization Plan, or (2) for functions delegated to another Federal department, agency, or instrumentality before January 31, 1973.

(c) Title 31, United States Code, section 665(c) shall not apply with respect to appropriations made to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 221 (a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "The Director may provide financial assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Director shall provide financial assistance", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that he may suspend financial assistance to recipients for failure to comply with applicable laws or regulations."

(b) Section 221(a) is further amended by striking out "also" in the last sentence.

(c) Section 221(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "he may extend financial assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "he shall extend financial assistance".

SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. Section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "the Director may develop" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Director shall develop".

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 4. Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"A vacancy occurring in the Office of the Director shall be filled in conformity with Title 5, United States Code, section 3348."

AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR

SEC. 5. Section 602(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Directors authority, under this subsection, to delegate any of his powers is hereby suspended for a period of one year from the date of enactment of this provision. For the duration of such period, the Director shall not delegate or transfer any of his powers or functions, or programs administered under this Act unless the President complies with the requirements of the Executive Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 903). The provisions of section 905(b) of such title shall not apply to a reorganization under this provision. Any transfers or delegations effected after January 31, 1973, not in compliance with this provision, are hereby rescinded and such powers, functions and programs are returned to the Director. This provision shall not apply to delegations made prior to January 31, 1973, and shall not affect the Director's authority to reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of such functions so delegated: *Provided*, That he complies with the requirements of this subsection to assure the maximum possible liaison between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the delegated agencies."

LIMITATIONS ON DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY

SEC. 6. Section 602(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking the semicolon following the word "otherwise" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That no authority exercised under this subsection shall have the effect of abolishing or reducing the powers or functions of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, any component thereof, or any program administered under this Act;".

LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 7. Section 602(h) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Director shall not transfer funds under this subsection for a period of one year from the date of enactment of this provision unless the President has complied with the requirements of the Executive Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 903). Any unexpended funds transferred to other Federal agencies after January 31, 1973, not in compliance with this provision, are directed to be returned to the Office of Economic Opportunity. This provision shall not apply to transfers of funds made to continue programs, or to exercise powers or functions transferred by the Director prior to January 31, 1973."

APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

SEC. 8. (a) Section 604 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) financial assistance under any title of the Act shall not be suspended for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency situations, nor shall an application for re-funding under any title be denied unless the recipient agency has been afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a full and fair hearing, and the Director solely on the basis of the record in that hearing has made a determination that the recipient agency cannot, in accordance with this Act and the rules, regulations, guidelines and other standards promulgated thereunder, satisfactorily administer the project or program for which financial assistance was extended: *Provided*, That the programs or projects instituted on a pilot, demonstration, or experimental basis pursuant to sections of the Act authorizing such programs or projects shall not be afforded the protections of this subsection."

(b) Section 604 of such Act is further amended by redesignating clause (3) as clause (3)(A) and striking the period at the end of section 604(3) and adding the following: "and the Director solely on the basis of the record in that hearing has made a determination that the recipient agency cannot, in accordance with this Act and the rules, regulations, guidelines and other standards promulgated thereunder, satisfactorily administer the project or program for which financial assistance was extended. (B) For the purpose of this section, refunding will be considered denied if the renewed funding will be reduced by more than 5 percent of Federal financial assistance available to the recipient agency under the immediately previous grant, contract or agreement, or if the period of operation authorized under the renewed grant, loan or agreement is less than 12 months. Only recipient agencies denied re-funding subsequent to January 31, 1973, shall be entitled to a hearing on a denial of re-funding pursuant to this section."

LEGAL SERVICES INVOLVED IN DRAFT COUNSELING

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the legal services programs of OEO were originally developed to provide legal aid to those disenfranchized members of our society who because of their low level of income, were unable to attain competent legal assistance. The program therefore provided legal help in the poverty areas of our country.

It has come to light however, that many of the programs have left their original mission of helping the poor and have thrust themselves into the political arena, with very little concern for the economic level of their clients.

I include the following article from the Chicago Tribune at this point in the RECORD:

LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OPENS OFFICE FOR DRAFT COUNSELING

A new draft counseling service has been opened by the North Shore office of the Cook County Legal Assistance Foundation, 828 Davis St., Evanston.

George Martin, communications coordinator for the foundation, said the service is the most complete yet offered. "The foundation not only will offer advice but will follow each man's case until it is ultimately resolved," he said. Lawyers aso will be found for men who need them.

The program, which is directed by Jerry Olsen, a member of the federal Volunteers In Service To America, also will conduct draft education sessions in North Shore high schools, according to Martin.

ADDRESS OF ASSISTANT DEFENSE SECRETARY JERRY W. FRIEDHEIM AT THE 10TH ANNUAL WEHRKUNDE MEETING IN MUNICH, GERMANY, FEBRUARY 27, 1973

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the main participants in the February meeting of the "Wehrkunde" organization in Munich, Germany, examining some of the defense problems facing ourselves and our NATO allies in Western Europe, was Mr. Jerry W. Friedheim, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

I am happy to bring Mr. Friedheim's forthright address on American defense policy in Europe to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

THE ROLE OF EUROPE IN U.S. POLICY

I was pleased to accept an invitation to present the United States' paper to this Wehrkunde Conference on "The Role of Europe in U.S. Policy," a subject both important and timely because of our mutual need to maintain a strong defense posture during the ongoing negotiations concerning security and cooperation in Europe and mutual and balanced force reductions.

As you are well aware, U.S. national security strategy is designed to move us toward President Nixon's goal of lasting world peace achieved and maintained through strong deterrence, based on strength, on partnership with our allies, and on a willingness to negotiate.

For 25 years after World War II our international role was shaped by a belief that the responsibility for world peace, stability, and prosperity rested largely on the United States. But what was true for the two decades following World War II is no longer feasible for the 1970's. The United States need no longer be the free world's only policeman. Increasingly, the domestic and international conditions—which once warranted such a role—have changed, and that change has called for a new role for the United States in international affairs.

Our President's international policy—the Nixon Doctrine—is a statement of the new U.S. role. And, at our Department of Defense our national security strategy, called realistic deterrence, provides the defense tool to implement the President's policies. The Nixon Doctrine defines a new partnership—a more realistic sharing of roles and responsibilities—between us and other nations in the building of common peace, stability and prosperity.

Our policy can be summed up in three statements:

First, the United States must continue to play a major role in world affairs. Our own security and well-being demand it. Our sheer weight in the international scheme of things makes it unavoidable. Any U.S. withdrawal into some sort of modern-day isolationism would be a recipe for disaster—disaster for us and the other nations of the free world. Our objective—and our responsibility—is and must be to work in concert and cooperation with other nations to build a stable, peaceful international order.

Second, the United States cannot and should not do everything itself. As President Nixon has said, "No nation has all the wisdom, and all the understanding, and all the energy required to act wisely on all problems, at all times, in every part of the world."

Moreover, the American people are realists, and they believe that we must place realistic limits on our world role in light of our own interests and our own domestic needs. And it is clear to all free nations that, in the long run, no free society can pursue and sustain international policies which its citizens do not support.

Third, other nations can and must assume greater responsibility than they have in the past in helping to provide for mutual security and economic well-being, and in building a peaceful and prosperous world order. Thus, we have the concept of NATO burden-sharing.

The post-war economic and political recovery here in Europe, and also in Japan, has long been an accomplished fact. Further, many of the newer nations of the world already have demonstrated that they have the resilience and the resources required to assume a greater share of the burden for their own security and well-being.

But, important as it may be that others are capable of doing more than they have done, there is an even more substantive reason for asking a greater degree of burden-sharing from them. It is our view that unless a nation feels itself primarily responsible for its own security and well-being, it will leave the task to others, and fail to marshal its resources and political will in its own defense.

For those nations which demonstrate that will and require technical assistance and materiel resources to assure their own security, the United States will continue to provide security assistance. But as President Nixon said in his recent inaugural address, "Let us measure what we will do for others by what they will do for themselves."

Apart from what a nation does for itself, there is the larger question of its responsibility for maintaining the peace. International order can be stable only if nations have a stake in its maintenance. Nations will not have such a stake unless they have participated in building that order.

These principles—these broad directions—guide current U.S. defense efforts.

In developing our national security strategy of realistic deterrence we have sought answers to these basic questions:

What should be the relative responsibilities of the United States and its allies for deterring threats?

What resources can and should each nation concerned contribute to the common defense?

How can we make optimum use under a total force concept of all available military and related resources to meet the requirements of the common security?

The answers to these questions, and the implementing actions taken delineate what has been accomplished over the past four years and what remains to be done in the years ahead.

First, deterrence of nuclear threats, both to the United States and its allies, has been and will continue to be primarily the responsibility of the United States. No other nation can maintain sufficient strategic nuclear power on the scale required to deter attack, threats or blackmail from the other nuclear super power. Without a continued U.S. nuclear deterrent for the common security of our allies, they might have neither the will nor the reason to do what can and must be done to deter conventional war threats.

But, while U.S. nuclear power is essential to the common security, it is not sufficient to deter the full spectrum of potential conflict and potential threats to U.S. and allied interests. Thus, the new Nixon Doctrine international policy concept of partnership and the new total force concept of our security strategy comes into full play.

In Asia we face jointly with our allies the problem of how to deter major theater conventional conflict and at the same time to deter sub-theater or localized conventional threats.

There is, of course, a tendency on the part of some persons—on both sides of the Atlantic—to see in the new era of negotiations a reason or an excuse to reduce defense efforts. Yet it must be apparent to thoughtful students of international security that free world and NATO military strength helped bring this new era about by effectively closing all paths except that of negotiation. And it must be equally apparent in Europe that Western positions and interests cannot be adequately protected and advanced in negotiations unless the West shows continued will and ability to maintain its military strength.

President Nixon in 1969 recognized the need to re-examine our collective NATO strategy to see if it was still viable in the light of new circumstances and new realities. We knew there were weaknesses and imbalances in NATO's conventional capabilities vis-a-vis those of the Warsaw Pact. The status of United States Forces in Europe had, before 1969, been affected by our troop commitments to Southeast Asia. It also was important to clear away some of the misunderstandings between the U.S. and its allies which had arisen over the years, and to work together to revitalize the cohesion of the Great Alliance.

Together, we carried out in NATO an exhaustive study of Alliance defense problems for the 1970's in which we reaffirmed the validity of our current military strategy and agreed on ways in which to improve NATO forces, their armaments, logistics, supporting infrastructure, and our ability to consult on their possible use in a crisis.

President Nixon has emphatically reaffirmed the American commitment to NATO. He has firmly said that, given a similar approach by our allies, the U.S. will maintain and will improve its forces deployed in the European area. We will keep that pledge.

But in the years immediately ahead, it will be very difficult to support an undiminished American troop presence in Europe if some of our partners whittle down the effectiveness of their own forces—whether by budget reductions, manpower reductions, or shorter terms of service.

At the NATO Defense Ministers' meeting two months ago our Secretary of Defense based his major intervention on burden-sharing and the need for more of it. Beyond his admonition that defense expenditures must grow in real terms and that funds must be used more efficiently in support of our common defense, he called for a continued European defense improvement program effort, and a decreased United States' cost share of NATO's infrastructure program. These suggestions will be difficult to realize, but the time is right, and our allies must understand the need to relieve us of some of the defense burden.

The era of negotiations is well upon us with agreements we already have concluded—such as SALT I and Berlin—and with CSCE preparatory talks and MBFR initial talks underway. And, in the light of this intricate complex of East-West discussions, we are beginning to hear a great deal from politicians and writers about some sort of profound and lasting shift in the basic attitude and approach of the Soviet Union toward the West.

This talk is premature, and detente without adequate defense is delusion.

Profound differences and disagreements continue between the East and ourselves. These differences cannot simply be ascribed to historical accident or misunderstanding. They are rooted in different conceptions of the rights and responsibilities of men and of governments, and in different approaches to dealing with other nations.

Nor dare we ignore other facts of international life.

We cannot discount the large, highly capable and improving Warsaw Pact armed forced in Europe.

We cannot shut our eyes to the rapid, sustained and growing Soviet arms expansion and arms improvement programs.

We cannot ignore the worldwide expansion of Soviet maritime forces and activity, including construction of an aircraft carrier.

We cannot safely disregard growing Soviet military presence in areas adjacent to NATO such as the Middle East and the Indian Ocean.

The simple fact is that as we meet here in early 1973 the Soviet military buildup, conventional as well as nuclear, continues with vigorous momentum.

Unless we face this strategic and political reality and make this recognition the starting point for our negotiating efforts, we jeoppardize the chances for achieving peace, while subjecting our vital interests and our people to serious danger.

This is not to say that we should be totally unprepared to consider certain reasonable risks for peace. On the contrary, we should seek prudently and carefully to build a new relationship, if possible, with the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe. It should be a relationship based on reciprocal self-restraint and on accommodation of mutual interests. But that relationship only can be built on the foundation of a strong and unified West.

This era of negotiations is, in many ways, more dangerous, difficult and demanding than the previous era of confrontation. But the United States is confident that NATO is equal to the challenge. Some persons have expressed concern about our ability to manage MBFR and other negotiations while maintaining allied cohesion. But however great a challenge MBFR may be for us, in many ways it will be an even more severe test for the East.

Whatever our problems here in the West, the mutual understanding and trust that has long prevailed among us will be a great asset over the months ahead as we negotiate with our adversaries. It is an asset all of us must guard with care.

Let us now briefly consider the U.S. Defense Budget for fiscal year 1974 and relate it to the U.S. role in Europe.

The Department of Defense Budget for fiscal year 1974 continues funding for a strong defense posture essential to the security of the United States and its allies in support of negotiations. It is an austere budget that reflects no real increase in total funds allocated for defense over fiscal year 1973. The transition from support of U.S. Force involvement in Southeast Asia to Vietnamization is substantially completed.

This permits in the fiscal year 1974 Budget the further modernization of our peacetime or "baseline forces," consistent with the principles of the Nixon force, without affecting the size and strength of U.S. Forces in Europe. The budget provides a program balanced between personnel, modernization and technology. And for the first time, it stabilizes the growth of personnel and related costs in order to preserve this balance.

Some of the more important points to be noted are:

FINANCIAL

Total budget authority requested for fiscal year 1974 is $85.0 billion, an increase of $4.1 billion over fiscal year 1973. This cost increase largely represents military and civilian pay increases.

Nixon Doctrine Military Assistance Programs are budgeted at $1.3 billion—an increase of $300 million over fiscal year 1973.

MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGES

Strategic Force funding remains level at $7.4 billion between fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974. Major Strategic Weapons Systems funding, however, reflects increases for research and development work on Trident ballistic missile submarines and significant decreases for Safeguard missile defense. Poseidon submarines and the proposed short-range attack missile.

General Purpose Forces program levels will increase slightly. This is the net result of decreases in funding for support of Southeast Asia offset by pay increases and modernization programs.

Significant modernization program increases cover funding for the F-15 fighter, F-4J fighter, a new attack aircraft, another nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, and a new series of destroyers.

FORCES AND PERSONNEL

Strategic Missile Forces remain stable with programs continuing for the Minuteman III modernization and the conversion of Polaris to Poseidon submarines.

Strategic Bomber Forces are reduced from 30 squadrons to 28 squadrons; reflecting fact-of-life retirements of older B-52's that have reached the end of their structural life.

Naval General Purpose Forces continue to reflect decreases as older, less effective ships and submarines are retired and replaced in lesser numbers by new, highly effective ships. Principal reductions are in destroyers and diesel submarines. Two nuclear ships and four nuclear attack submarines will join the fleet along with five destroyer escorts and a missile frigate.

General Purpose Ground and Air Forces remain substantially at the level programmed for fiscal year 1973.

Military personnel are programmed to decrease by 55,000 to a total of 2,233,000 during fiscal year 1974. This is in part attributable to programmed reductions in Southeast Asia support and in part to efficiencies in overall staffing.

Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson reported, in response to questions last month by a member of the U.S. Congress, that the most recent Department of Defense estimate of costs for the U.S. Forces and Support Programs earmarked for NATO is roughly $16 billion annually—about one-fifth of our total Defense Budget. This estimate is defined as the annual savings to the Defense Department Budget that would accrue if all of the following did not exist:

All of the U.S. General Purpose Forces and related support elements and headquarters in Europe.

Some of the U.S. General Purpose Forces (both Active and Reserve) that are formally committed to NATO but are not in Europe.

Variable costs of U.S.-based support including training, individual support and logistics for the above forces.

Military assistance for European countries and the NATO infrastructure program.

About $7 billion of the $16 billion is related to the cost of U.S. combat forces actually in Europe and to their U.S.-based support.

SUMMARY

I have described for this Wehrkunde Conference the dominant defense implications of the Nixon Doctrine which has guided U.S. national security planning and actions over the past four years, particularly as they relate to Europe. By any standard of measurement we have covered together a good part of the security road that we must continue to travel together. And it is in the nature of the enterprise that the first seps were the hardest. For they entailed reorienting long-held views and patterns of actions, not only on our part, but on yours. For a quarter century, we had all believed that it was fitting and feasible for the United States to assume primary responsibility for countering all threats to the common security. The lesson we have learned together over the past four years is that partnership, not predominance—sharing, not supremacy—is in our common interest.

"Shared Sufficiency" is what it is all about. The Alliance has been and remains the world's mightiest force for peace. And as President Nixon has said, for the United States this year is the "Year of Europe."

THE ILLUSION OF SWEDISH NEUTRALITY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Sweden's increasingly self-righteous pronouncements concerning American policy in Vietnam have convinced many observers that under the leadership of Prime Minister Olof Palme, Sweden has finally abandoned its traditional policy of "neutrality," even though that policy has hardly been "neutral" for many years.

In his most recent outburst, Palme compared the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam to the worst work of the Nazis in World War II. Mr. Palme did not mention, however, that Sweden refused to join in the Allied effort against Nazi Germany, and that while Danes and Norwegians suffered under a brutal Nazi occupation, Swedes maintained a high level of prosperity by doing a substantial business with Hitler. Only in 1973, when Mr. Palme feels it necessary to express his solicitude for the regime in Hanoi, do the barbarities of Nazism seem so overwhelming.

Sweden has not been neutral in fact for some time. It has significantly increased its trade with Communist countries and there has been a growing development in the export of technology and cooperation in production. ASEA, the large Swedish electrical company, for example, has an agreement with Hungary to manufacture certain components on a profit-sharing basis for incorporation in goods distributed in Eastern Europe.

According to Prof. Martin Schiff of the City University of New York, writing in Modern Age:

The increase in trade with the Communist bloc nations has been accompanied by mounting and continuous criticism of such American allies as Greece, Portugal, Spain, as well as South Africa, South Vietnam, and Rhodesia while the dictatorial regimes and atrocities of the Soviet Union, its Eastern European satellites, its Arab client states and North Vietnam have rarely been rebuked . . . Sweden never voiced more than a fleeting objection to Viet Cong atrocities or the use of North Vietnamese or Russian tanks to invade South Vietnamese villages.

Professor Schiff provides a number of examples of Sweden's acquiescence to the will of the Soviet Union.

Typical of the Swedish attitude in recent years is the Government's concern for Russian feelings in the Solzhenitsyn affair and its decision to award him the 1970 Nobel Prize at a private ceremony rather than at an official ceremony in the Swedish Embassy in Moscow.

Another example occurred in the Hjalmarson incident in 1959. At that time Jarl Hjalmarson, the Conservation Party leader, was removed by the Swedish Government from membership on Sweden's U.N. delegation, a body traditionally multiparty in composition reflecting both Government and opposition viewpoints. The removal was justified on the basis that Hjalmarson was too pro-Western and anti-Soviet in his speeches. He had criticized the Swedish Government for inviting Nikita Khrushchev to visit Sweden because of the 1956 stifling of the Hungarian revolution.

Prime Minister Palme, notes Professor Schiff, has accelerated the movement of Sweden toward a pro-Soviet position. He kept Sweden's doors open to American draft dodgers and deserters and welcomed Bertrand Russell's Vietnam war-crimes tribunal to Stockholm. Under his prodding, the Riksdag has dispatched an impressive $15 million a year into North Vietnam. No similar solicitude has been expressed for the victims of Vietcong atrocities, for intellectuals suffering in Soviet slave labor camps, or for the millions slaughtered by the regime of Mao Tse-tung.

I wish to share with my colleagues Professor's Schiff's thoughtful analysis of Swedish "neutrality." Following is his article, "Swedish Neutrality in Transition," as it appeared in the fall 1972 issue of Modern Age:

SWEDISH NEUTRALITY IN TRANSITION

(By Martin Schiff)

Sweden's tradition of neutrality evolved from the beginning of the nineteenth century as an expedient for a small nation anxious to stay of of costly, unrewarding wars. The neutrality tradition remained essentially devoid of moral and ideological overtones even through two world wars and the ravages of Nazism. In fact, the practice of Swedish neutrality during World War II accommodated the Nazi war machine until the Allied forces began to win the war in 1943. Government policy statements defined and defended the neutrality policy as freedom from alliances in peace, aiming at neutrality in war. Such a formulation is still used today, but it is by no means certain that the neutrality policy remains free of moral and ideological considerations and rooted in its pragmatic antecendents.

After World War II, the Swedish government headed by Tage Erlander began to emphasize that the neutrality policy was not the same as passivity of isolationism. Great stress was placed on the need for international solidarity especially through such organizations as the United Nations. Sweden pledged to participate fully in the U.N. principle of collective security and "in the event of a future conflict to give up neutrality to the extent that the charter of the organization demands." Such a pledge, however, was inevitably qualified by the condition that there be no subdivision of the great powers into two camps within the U.N. If such a subdivision took place, the government explained, traditional Swedish neutrality would be reasserted and Sweden would remain outside of any group or bloc formation.

With the onset of the Cold War and the breakdown of the U.N.'s collective security function, the Swedish government exercised great restraint in defining its foreign policy role. World peace and international cooperation remained the ultimate goals of Swedish foreign policy, but the government made very clear the limited role it envisaged for Sweden to these ends. In a series of government statements from 1950 through the early 1960's, Sweden stated that it was not able to play any part in bridging the gaps existing between the great power blocs.

In recent years bilateral aid has assumed greater importance in the Swedish foreign aid program because it gives Sweden a more direct voice in implementing the goals of the program. It is not considered threatening to neutrality *per se* because of Sweden's obvious lack of power ambitions. What has become more controversial for neutrality, however, is Sweden's engagement with third world liberation movements and the bilateral aid and moral support given these movements. Foremost among these movements has been the Vietnamese National Liberation Front, but the Palestinian Arab refugees and the black struggle in South Africa and Rhodesia have also received significant Swedish support. The controversy over this ideological turn in the bilateral aid program reached its peak in 1969 when former Minister of Education, Olof Palme, succeeded as Prime Minister, Tage Erlander, who retired after twenty-three years in office. Palme, who the previous year had marched in a pro-Viet Cong torchlight parade with the North Vietnamese ambassador, raised the furor when he pledged forty million dollars in aid and credits to North Vietnam and acknowledged a greater sympathy for the North Vietnamese government than for the Saigon regime. The U.S. government, reacting angrily to Palme's policy statements, announced that it would consider financial reprisals against Sweden if the forty million dollar aid pledge was indeed granted.

To many Western observers Sweden's commitment, both moral and financial, to third world liberation movements represented less a new, activist neutrality than a departure from neutrality. In fact the suspicion of Swedish neutrality in Western circles has significant antecedents. First, there was Sweden's refusal to permit French and British troops to enter Swedish territory during World War II. The troop movements, designed to aid Finland in its war with Russia and concomitantly cut off the supply of Swedish iron ore to Germany, would undoubtly have turned Sweden into a battleground and seriously undermined both its neutrality policy and its security. Then in 1948 when the United States formulated plans for NATO, Sweden not only refused to join but proposed its own alternatives, a Scandinavian defense community. The Swedish plan, which was never implemented, would have linked Sweden, Denmark and Norway in a neutral defense alliance. During the peak of the Cold War in the early 1950's, both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles made ill-concealed references to Sweden when castigating a nation of rampant sex, high suicide rate, excessive socialism and moral neutrality in the war between good and evil.

To a certain extent Sweden's unwillingness to openly support the Allies during World War II and affiliate with the Atlantic alliance after the war undoubtedly contributed to a deterioration in U.S.-Swedish relations leading to the bitter disagreement over Vietnam. Almost from the inception of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam in 1960, Sweden was the foremost non-Communist critic of America's Vietnam policy. Ultimately all Swedish political parties and the whole Swedish press came to criticize this policy in varying degrees and frequencies. The basic disagreement with America's Vietnam policy has been over what Sweden considers the fallacious assumptions of that policy. Instead of a war against monolithic Communist imperialism and the consequences of the "domino" theory as the U.S. perceives it, Sweden has long considered the war as an American imperialist aggression against a genuine national liberation movement. The fact that Sweden could identify with the Vietnamese people against the American government was not perceived as a violation of neutrality; it was not the Soviet Union or Communist China which was supported but the Vietnamese people.

Notwithstanding the Swedish rationale for its steadfast and highly vocal criticism of America's Vietnam policy, there is no denying the fact that the neutrality policy has undergone a striking metamorphosis in the past twenty-five years from isolationist to activist and now apparently to ideological commitment. The dispute with the U.S. over Vietnam is perhaps less a cause than an effect of this metamorphosis. Swedish neutrality during the 1960's has been increasingly explained in strongly moral terms especially with respect to the aspirations of the third-world. Sweden's commitment to third-world liberation movements is now as important a tenet of its neutrality policy as its economic and technical aid to newly-independent countries. This ideological redefinition of neutrality leaves little, if any, distinction between Swedish neutrality and third world neutralism of the Indian variety.

Unlike Swiss and Austrian neutrality, Swedish neutrality is not mandated by its constitution or any treaty. Swedish neutrality is based solely on tradition which has itself been dependent on maintaining the confidence of the Great Powers in Sweden's willingness and ability to remain neutral in the event of war. Yet the ideological turn in Swedish neutrality has been allowed to erode Western, and especially American, confidence in Swedish foreign policy. Sweden has provided a haven for several hundred American war deserters and extended diplomatic recognition to the government of North Vietnam. Sweden has been the only country in Western Europe to both openly encourage such desertion and award such full diplomatic recognition to the Hanoi regime. In March 1968, irked by Swedish opposition to the Vietnam war, President Johnson recalled Ambassador William W. Heath for five weeks as an American protest against the Swedish attitude. Then in 1970 Jerome Holland, the new U.S. ambassador to Sweden, was insulted and pelted with eggs by a crowd of young Swedes upon his arrival in Sweden, an incident viewed with shock and disgust by the overwhelming majority of Swedes. Sweden has allowed the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to open an office in Stockholm and fly its flag. Sweden was also among the first of the non-Communist nations to recognize the government of Communist China and lobby for Communist Chinese admission to the United Nations.

Racial discrimination by whites against blacks has also been an important issue in Sweden's new ideological neutrality policy. By way of contrast, Sweden is silent about the continued prevalence of slavery and the black slave trade in such states as Saudi Arabia, Dahomey, Sudan, Upper Volta and others. Criticisms of these countries would run counter to the positive third world image Sweden tries to cultivate. Confined to criticisms of discrimination by white governments in South Africa and Rhodesia, Swedish foreign policy is much less controversial than it is on the Vietnam issue; racial discrimination in these two countries is basically devoid of Cold War connotations. The Swedish government has cited the U.N. charter and the Declaration of Human Rights as a basis for its support of U.N. recommendations directed against the racial policies of these two governments. Sweden, however, has been less decisive with respect to the implementation of any such recommendations. Sweden has abstained from General Assembly resolutions voted to boycott all trade with these two nations. Adopting a very legalistic interpretation of the U.N. charter on this question, Sweden has contended that only the Security Council may institute such a boycott with the General Assembly limited to exerting pressure. Sweden has supported an unofficial boycott against the purchase of South African goods, yet Swedish trade with South Africa during the past decade has flourished. In 1968, for example, Sweden exported forty-five million dollars worth of goods to South Africa while importing twelve million dollars.

Sweden's unheralded but lucrative trade with South Africa provides a clue to one possible cause of Sweden's new ideological neutrality. In the past decade Sweden has experienced increasing economic problems. Mounting unemployment has caused a search for new markets. In the West, Sweden is faced with rising difficulties in selling its exports because of increasing costs brought about by strikes and highly inflationary wage settlements. American protective tariffs, import quotas and the recent import surcharges have further discouraged increased American-Swedish trade. Moreover, the development of the European Economic Community and the likelihood that Sweden is to be excluded from that organization has made future trade prospects with Europe doubtful. Thus, as Western trade prospects dim, Sweden is forced to seek trade elsewhere. In 1971, Sweden's trade with EEC and the U.S.A. declined while its Eastern European and third world trade increased. Ideological neutrality viewed in this context takes on an economic orientation which permits tacit trade even with a South Africa. The ideological commitment thereby may fulfill a pragmatic economic purpose much as the postwar activist commitment did all along.

The developing countries have a negative balance of trade which provides a means for highly export-oriented countries such as Sweden to gain access to their resources as well as their markets. Even if such countries cannot afford to buy much from Sweden, they provide a tremendous potential for the application of Sweden's advanced technology to their raw materials. Trade with Communist countries, on the other hand, provides Sweden with a more immediate alternative to replacing the lost American and European trade. Sweden's advocacy of the Communist Chinese cause since 1950, for example, has now put Sweden in the forefront of Western commercial contact with China, especially Swedish engineering and metallurgical firms. China has also announced that it will export oil to friendly countries, among which Sweden was specified.

Sweden has substantially increased its trade with all Communist states in the last five years. There has also been a notable development in the export of technology and cooperation in production. ASEA, the big Swedish electrical concern, for example, has an agreement with Hungary to manufacture certain components on a profit-sharing basis for incorporation in goods distributed in Eastern Europe. The increase in trade with the Communist bloc nations has been accompanied by mounting and continuous criticism of such American allies as Greece, Portugal, Spain as well as South Vietnam, South Africa and Rhodesia while the dictatorial regimes and atrocities of the Soviet Union, its Eastern European satellites, its Arab client states and North Vietnam have rarely been rebuked. The Soviet invasions of Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 did meet with criticism from the Swedish government and press, but the objections were not sustained and the new *status quo* was accepted each time without further critique. Sweden never voiced more than a fleeting objection to Viet Cong atrocities or the use of North Vietnamese or Russian tanks to invade South Vietnamese villages.

Typical of the Swedish attitude in recent years is the government's solicitude for Russian feelings in the Solzhenitsyn affair and its decision to award him the 1970 Nobel Prize at a private ceremony rather than at an official ceremony in the Swedish embassy in Moscow. Such solicitude seems to signify subservience to the Soviet government's literary-political standards, implying at least partial repudiation of the judgment of the Nobel Prize committee in honoring Solzhenitsyn. No similar concern seems to have bothered the Swedish government in repeatedly denouncing the United States on the Vietnam war and in giving haven to American deserters.

The Swedish government has repeatedly denied that its neutrality policy is in transition toward a form of ideological neutrality or neutralism. Yet there have been signs of a shift in Sweden's traditional neutrality toward a greater affinity for the third world and even the Communist bloc since the end of World War II. One subtle indication of this shift was the increasing official usage of the very term "neutrality policy" after World War II instead of the longer term "freedom from alliances in peacetime aimed at neutrality in wartime." The Social Democratic government explained that the shorter term was used because it cleared away any misunderstanding about any presumed options Sweden might have of either going to war or remaining neutral once a major power war broke out. The opposition parties, it was explained, preferred to use their own short term, "non-alliance policy," to imply that Sweden need not necessarily be neutral in any future war between the Western powers and the Soviets but might join up with the West. The opposition parties for their part explained their dislike of the term "neutrality policy" on the ground that it implied ideological neutrality and even pacifism.

The Hjalmarson incident in 1959 also seemed to indicate an unusual solicitude for Soviet feelings. Jarl Hjalmarson, the Conservative party leader, was removed by the Swedish government from membership on Sweden's U.N. delegation, a body traditionally multi-party in composition reflecting both government and opposition viewpoints. The removal was justified on the grounds that Hjalmarson was too pro-Western and anti-Soviet in his speeches. He had criticized the Swedish government for inviting the Soviet head of state, Khrushchev, to visit Sweden because of the 1956 Hungarian massacre. He also advocated military cooperation with the Western powers. Hjalmarson and his supporters contended, however, that "an exaggerated fear of expressing our opinion can undermine confidence in our neutrality." The Hjalmarson episode has been analyzed as illustrative of the fact that Sweden's freedom of action in foreign policy is limited by the need to retain the confidence of the great powers. Yet, in retrospect, it was the confidence of the Soviet Union that had to be maintained.

The Soviet Union's overwhelming presence and proximity to Sweden after 1945 seems to have some considerable relation to the reversal in Sweden's German-oriented neutrality which took place. In October, 1946 Sweden signed a trade and credit agreement with Russia. The Soviets received a commercial credit of 1,000 million kronor (about 280 million dollars in 1946 dollars). The credit was to be used during the next five years and was to include purchases of electrical equipment, machines, and various products of heavy industry. Calculated on the first half of 1946 these purchases represented "20 to 30 percent of the total export value of the engineering industry and about 50 percent of the locomotive industry's production capacity."

This agreement with the Russians aroused great controversy both in Sweden and abroad, especially in the United States. Sweden had never had a comparable agreement with the Soviets before. The Swedish government defended the agreement as a means of taking precautions against expected depression and unemployment during the initial postwar period. Others have explained the trade agreement in terms of Sweden's attempt to assuage its guilt feelings for helping Germany during World War II to wage war on Russia. The opposition parties, however, denounced the agreement as an unnecessary concession to Soviet interests.

The agreement turned out to be very harmful to Sweden economically. Sweden experienced severe inflation and deflection of trade as a result of absorption of much of Sweden's export productivity by the Russians through the trade credits. On March 15, 1947 the Swedish government put a complete ban on imports in a move to fight inflation. There was also widespread dissatisfaction with the fact that Russia was sending so many engineers and other technical personnel, numbering in the hundreds, to Sweden and possibly undermining the Swedish economy.

Another controversial indication of a subtle shift of Sweden's neutrality in the direction of Russia was the government's decision in 1945 to extradite Baltic refugees to Russia on the ground that they had been collaborators against the Soviet Union. This action was regarded by many as a degrading political concession to Soviet pressure.

In pragmatic terms, America's involvement in Vietnam in the 1960's coupled with successful Soviet expansion and inroads in Latin America, North America, the Mediterranean Sea, the Middle East, the Indian Ocean and even the reassertion of Soviet hegemony in Hungary and Czechoslovakia may justify a less subtle, pro-Soviet orientation in the neutrality policy. Swedish support for the Vietnamese national liberation movement is, at least indirectly, support for the Soviet Union's most important Asian ally. The Soviet Union has in fact supplied about ninety percent of North Vietnam's war materiel. The third world liberation movements have characteristically been directed against the United States and its Western allies. Swedish support for these movements, therefore, with no comparable support for the multitude of minorities brutalized by Communist regimes appears to further accentuate a pro-Soviet shift in neutrality that started after 1945. Despite government denials, such a form of neutrality strongly resembles the neutralism status that has been advocated by, among others, India's Nehru, Egypt's Nasser, Indonesia's Sukarno and, currently, Yugoslavia's Tito.

It is questionable, however, whether this apparent ideological turn in the neutrality policy serves pragmatic ends even if based upon pragmatic considerations. In terms of trade. Sweden's total trade with the West—EEC, EFTA and the U.S.A.—amounts to approximately four times its total trade with the rest of the world including Eastern Europe. From an economic standpoint, the expected decline in Western trade both in the near and long terms cannot possibly be compensated for in the third world and the Soviet bloc. Yet, from a political standpoint, Sweden's increasing isolation from the West and alignment with pro-Soviet and anti-Western elements in the third world are accelerating the trend toward national economic decline.

Few public figures in Sweden call for an end to neutrality for such a move would probably cause a political uproar. The neutrality *tradition* which has kept Sweden out of war for over one-hundred-fifty years is strong enough to prevent public debate over the question of the present and future utility of the neutrality *policy*. However, the economic realities are that tacit acceptance of the presumed neutrality-EEC dichotomy would pit Sweden's eight million people in economic competition with a European Economic Community encompassing some two-hundred-sixty million people including Sweden's current EFTA trading partners, Britain, Norway and Denmark. The Conservative party press, especially *Svenska Dagbladet* and *Göteborgs Handels-Och-Sjöfartstidning*, has recently attempted to stir public awareness of Sweden's grim economic prospects and suggested "alternative definitions" of neutrality.

In his book, *Inrikes utrikespolitik*, Gösta Bohman, a prominent Conservative party leader and legislator, contends that the ideological turn in Sweden's neutrality policy against American interests in Vietnam is intended for internal consumption. Bohman argues that the Swedish government has purposefully catered to sensationalism in the mass media and extreme anti-Americanism left-wing groups which are the most politically active. Speeches by Prime Minister Palme and other government representatives fanned the flames of anti-American hatred and instigated the egg-throwing and racial abuse directed against U.S. Ambassador Holland. Bohman's argument is not so much a defense of America's Vietnam policy as it is an attack on what he considers the unbalanced, simplified and insulting ways in which Palme government has criticized that policy. The Social Democrats, Bohman finds, sought a party monopoly on Sweden's national indignation over the Vietnam war by adopting the most extreme anti-American positions. Bohman illustrates how Social Democratic Party campaign literature in 1970 solicited contributions with the slogan "Stand up behind Palme's and the government's protest against the war in Vietnam." He observes how Swedish recognition of North Vietnam is an abandonment of Sweden's traditional policy of not recognizing divided states. The Social Democratic Party program dealt very extensively with non-European problems but very little with European problems. The government's foreign policy engagement appeared to increase in direct relation to the distance from Sweden, a fact which was emphasized by Sweden's opponents in EEC. Bohman accuses the Palme government, moreover, of undermining Western confidence in Sweden's traditional neutrality and thereby Swedish national security as well in return for anticipated internal political gains. Bohman's conclusions were supported by other Swedes including, among others, Erik Boheman, a Liberal party leader, speaker in the *Riksdag's* first chamber and former Swedish ambassador to the U.S.A., in his book *Tankar i en talmanstol* (*Thoughts from the Speaker's Chair*), and the directors of the Federation of Swedish Industries, Erik Braunerhielm and Wilhelm Paues.

Swedish public opinion remains strongly opposed to America's Vietnam policy, but other aspects of Sweden's neutrality orientation toward the third world may be less popular. For example, a 1956 public opinion poll of 1146 people on the question of increasing Swedish governmental aid to the poor lands in Asia and Africa found 61 percent of the men and 55 percent of the women polled to be opposed to such an increase. A similar poll conducted in 1961 by the Swedish Institute for Public Opinion (SIPO) disclosed a 64 percent figure for those who did not desire an increase in Swedish governmental aid. Moreover, the number favoring an increase dropped from about 37 percent in 1956 to 24 percent in 1961 with the remainder undecided. In general, Swedes are not especially fond of foreigners as indicated by a 1966 SIPO poll in which 31 percent of Swedes maintained that there were too many foreigners in Sweden. This was a sharp rise from the 13 percent who felt this way in 1957.

The 1970 election results in Sweden were a setback for Olof Palme even though the Social Democrats won the election as they had every one since 1932. Gathering 45 percent of the total vote and 163 seats, they lost their absolute majority in the new 350-seat unicameral *Riksdag*. The decline in Social Democratic popularity from its 50.1 percent total in 1968 was attributed to an unusual rash of wildcat strikes in 1969, inflation that sent food prices up 7 percent in 1970, a worsening housing shortage, and other economic problems. Palme stated that he did not see in the election returns any disapproval of policies of his government in support of North Vietnam.

By the autumn of 1972 both Prime Minister Palme and the Social Democrats appeared to be losing still more popularity. Public opinion polls indicated that Swedes were increasingly distressed by economic problems. Public confidence in Mr. Palme had reportedly dropped even further than in his party. Although the Social Democrats are the predominant party by far in Sweden and are likely to remain so in the 1973 parliamentary elections, the declining public confidence indicates the indirect effects of Sweden's third-world and Soviet-oriented neutrality policy. The economic repercussions of isolation from the U.S.A. and Western Europe—an isolation amounting to what has been termed here ideological neutrality—will likely prove disastrous for Sweden in the long run. The political repercussions of this isolation could reduce Sweden to the status of Finland or, even worse, an Eastern European Soviet satellite. Sweden has tacitly assumed that the West would never permit a Soviet attack on Sweden to go unanswered. This assumption, however, could prove dangerously unwarranted if the transition from Sweden's traditional and active neutrality to ideological, anti-Western neutrality becomes permanent.

OTHER COMPANIES AND AREAS BACK "911" CONCEPT

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I included in the RECORD for the sake of my colleagues, a listing of all the cities in the Bell system that have either gone on "911," the emergency number, or plan to do so in the near future. Now I wish to add the cities operating under other telephone systems:

OTHER TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

As of January, 1972 General Telephone Company reports the following cities using the "911" emergency number:

ILLINOIS

Bloomington

MICHIGAN

Muskegon

NORTH CAROLINA

Durham

Butner-Creedmoor

OHIO

Sylvania

PENNSYLVANIA

York County (scheduled for '74)

OKLAHOMA

Broken Arrow

Wynoka

TEXAS

College Station

Irving

Lemesa

Sherman

WASHINGTON

Sunnyland

Everett

This is a total of 13 systems representing a population of almost 1,000,000.

The Independent Telephone Association has also reported on their cities using "911" (excluding those of General Telephone). These cities are:

ALASKA

Kodiak
Sitka

ALABAMA

Haleyville
Leeds
New Hope
Owens Cross Roads
Ashford

CALIFORNIA

Kerman

FLORIDA

Lake Buena Vista

ILLINOIS

Geneseo

MINNESOTA

St. James

NEBRASKA

Aurora
Doniphan
Giltner
Hampton
Hordville
Marquette
Phillips
Trumbull
Lincoln
Beatrice
Plattsmouth
Hebron

NEVADA

Tonopah
Yerington
Boulder City

NEW YORK

Jamestown
Hancock

OHIO

Amherst

PENNSYLVANIA

New Bethlehem
Butler
Meridian
Connoquenessing
Nixon

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lexington

VIRGINIA

Manassas
Nokesville
Triangle
Quantico
Dale City
Woodbridge
Independence Hall
Occoquan

WASHINGTON

Westport

WYOMING

Mount View
Fort Bridger
Lyman

These cities provide another 348,262 individuals using "911." Twenty-four companies are involved.

EXPEDITED ACTION NEEDED ON COLLEGE STUDENT AID FUNDS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Federal funding of college student aid needs expedited attention.

This is a matter concerning present and potential college students—not the colleges themselves.

The student aid program for the next school year, beginning in the fall, needs clarification and appropriations as soon as possible so continuing students and new students can make their scholastic plans.

Involved principally are students who probably would be unable to begin or continue college study without Federal help.

The needed funds are to be included in a pending supplemental appropriation bill. I hope sincerely that the Committee on Appropriations will see fit to approve moneys in line with the funding pattern outlined in the Education Act Amendments of 1972.

With the programs now in limbo, students cannot know what Federal help may be available to them in the next school year. This makes it difficult for them—and the colleges—to set their schedules for 1973–74. Planning time is short.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had the pleasure of attending a reception with many college and university presidents, including Dr. E. K. Fretwell, Jr., president of State University College at Buffalo, N.Y.

State University College is just one of the several fine colleges and universities which we are fortunate to have in the Buffalo area. The Federal aid program, to my own knowledge, has made it possible for many capable and deserving students to obtain higher education which otherwise might have been denied them.

Mr. Speaker, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities issued an informative statement on the student aid subject following its meeting here. I include the text as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT

A large number of college and university presidents of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities have come to Washington because of an emergency situation: Unless Congress acts rapidly, hundreds of thousands of students will be denied an education.

In the past, presidents have discussed with Congress the need for institutional aid, the construction and remodeling of facilities, and the funding of specific categorical programs. But today we are not here for our institutions; we are here for our students.

Reports from our student aid officers indicate a growing sense of disillusionment and frustration because they cannot tell students what type of assistance they can expect this fall.

We agree with the President that no qualified student should be deprived of the opportunity to receive a post-secondary education because of a lack of adequate financial resources.

We support the President's request for $622 million for the newly enacted Basic Educational Opportunity Grants program and $250 million for the College Work-Study program.

We are concerned, however, not only with the most needy students, but also with the plight of the middle class student who might have expected through continuing educational opportunity grants and low cost student loans some assistance in the face of increasing costs.

To help the middle class student, the law requires that, at a minimum, $130.1 million be appropriated for the Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants before the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants may be funded.

It is urgent that all student assistance programs be funded in the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973 now before the Congress.

We therefore call on the Congress of the United States to act expeditiously in passing this bill so that it can keep its commitment to the students of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the American Association of State Colleges & Universities adopted the following resolution at its February 28 meeting:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the uncertainty concerning student aid is causing great distress among our students in the 300 institutions comprising this Association, and,

Whereas the traditional student body of our institutions enrolls a very large number of students whose family incomes average less than $10,000 per year, and,

Whereas the Basic Education Opportunity Grant program, enacted into law in the spring of 1972 would provide needed aid to such students,

Therefore, be it resolved that on behalf of our member institutions the Board of Directors urges immediate action on the part of the Congress of the United States in passing a Supplementary Appropriations Bill which would include funding for the student aid programs.

Be it further resolved that the Congress agree to the President's request for BEOG's of $622 million for the current fiscal year and no less than $250 million for the College Work-Study program for the current fiscal year.

Be it further resolved that in keeping with the laws specifications requiring no less than minimal funding for the SEOG and Direct Student Loan program, the Congress appropriate $130 million for SEOG's and $293 million for the Direct Student Loan. Building upon the Basic Grants these programs would enable us to provide genuine education opportunity to students whose financial circumstances otherwise would deprive them of it.

ANALYSIS OF THE LOCAL IMPACT OF THE BUDGET

HON. BARBARA JORDAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress are deeply concerned about the administration's proposed budget cutbacks for fiscal year 1974 and their impact on the Nation. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative MICHAEL HARRINGTON, has undertaken an unprecedented, detailed analysis of that budget and its implications for the Sixth Congressional District of Massachusetts. The techniques he has developed for translating cuts in national programs into precise impacts on towns, cities, and counties in Massachusetts can be of invaluable use to all of us. His suggestions provide the basis for similar interpretations of the effects of this proposed budget on each congressional district throughout the country. I deeply appreciate Representative HARRINGTON's willingness to share this information with his colleagues, and include a summary of his techniques for analyzing the budget at this point in my remarks:

HARRINGTON METHODOLOGY ON THE BUDGET

I. ASCERTAINING TERMINATED PROGRAMS AND THOSE SIGNIFICANTLY CUT

(A) Using the Federal Budget for FY 74 and its Appendix, we determined which programs were being terminated and which were being cut significantly. This is a page-by-page process of examining each program.

(B) If terminated programs are supposedly being replaced by revenue sharing, the fact was noted, but the program was still included as terminated. Where possible, the totals for these programs were summed and compared to the total proposed revenue sharing figure. This difference was noted.

(C) Some programs given in the Budget are "transferred" to other agencies. This too was noted but particular attention was paid to whether or not additional funds had been allocated to the new agency to cope with the additional programs.

II. SIGNIFICANCE TO THE STATE, COUNTY, AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(A) Using the Federal Outlays book prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity we determined what money had entered the state in 1972 outlays. (This is the most recent edition and should not be considered comprehensive.) Figures are given for the state, counties, and cities and towns with populations of 25,000 or more. We used this as an indication of which of the terminated programs were important to our Congressional District.

(B) To determine the general magnitude of the problem and to develop a list of manageable length of major programs being reduced or terminated in the District, the national percentage cuts (derived from the Budget Appendix and available from Congressman Harrington) for all programs in Massachusetts were applied to estimated Federal Outlays in the District. This involved the necessary assumption that any change in a Budget line-item will apply across-the-board. This allowed development of a table estimating the line-item impact of the Budget on the State, County Congressional District, and cities and towns (population of 25,000 or greater). The exercise then became a race to replace these estimates with "harder" figures.

1. This was done to give the parameters of the cuts. We know that cuts will not be the same percentage in every area.

2. The Federal Outlay book does not reflect all expenditures in any given area. This caveat must be noted. The statistical estimate will therefore be a minimum in almost every instance.

(C) Using this information, we decided on which expenditures to concentrate; those decided upon were either: 1) those of large dollar cuts since clearly an economic effect existed, and 2) those that appeared to be widespread over the District. In fact, this included almost all programs of a substantial nature, and excluded most of the cuts in administration.

III. INFORMATION GATHERING

(A) We used a two-pronged attack: 1) gathering information on a state level—approaching state agencies and/or the regional or state offices of the Federal Government, and 2) information from the cities and towns in our District.

1. Staff members and a few knowledgeable volunteers contacted people in the state agencies and/or Federal Government whom we assumed to be either interested in the budget cuts or knowledgeable about funding throughout the state.

This happened sometimes by chance—people called our office because they sought information about the cuts or were registering their opposition to them. We in turn asked them for their help. (This was at times fruitful—at times not. Their subsequent performance as information providers has given us a list of dependable people).

The volunteers we used were of two types: (a) those from projects or programs within our District that were being severely cut back, and could provide us with detailed information. We found that in justifying and explaining their programs to us, they provided comprehensive and detailed information; and (b) people from voluntary or charitable agencies greatly concerned about budget cuts. These people had a storehouse of information and often knew of planned programs that now had no chance of being initiated.

2. We developed a questionnaire to solicit facts about each line-item locally. A poll developed in the District will be available from Congressman Harrington once finalized and tested. A description of each significant line-item for which there were expenditures in Massachusetts and which we found necessary to communicate with state and local officials is now available.

3. We used interested volunteers to poll each city and town. Using a list of programs we provided and recommendations regarding sources, they attempted to fill in a chart we had provided, listing programs, which asked for 1973 spending levels, employees, and recipients of services, and their projected demand for 1974 had no cuts been made.

Initial contact was made with each city and town by inviting a representative of their governing bodies to attend a meeting at which the purpose of the project was explained.

In some instances sufficient information was provided by these town officials so that no further information had to be gathered from their towns.

In most instances, volunteers returned to the towns and interviewed town accountants, federal funds coordinators (in the larger cities), school superintendents, directors of directly funded programs. In small towns usually the school superintendent and a town official could provide us with comprehensive information.

(B) It is important to use volunteers from the area. Not only is this a guarantee of a better reception, but residents of a town are familiar with programs discussed in town meetings or councils, and of long-range plans of a municipality.

(C) This two-pronged attack did not completely cover all program cuts. Many funds go directly to institutions or individuals. Two areas of significance in this category are: hospital programs and higher education programs, including financial aid. Again, after an initial evaluation of the effects of the 1974 proposed Budget was made, we contacted colleges on a somewhat individual level, and used a knowledgeable volunteer to gather information on health care.

IV. COLLATION OF INFORMATION

(A) We used information about individual project cuts that had been gathered from state/federal agencies to fill in the gaps in our towns and city lists. Housing projects are a primary example of some of these gaps. Here the intention was to illustrate the loss of money to each town and city. We tried to include employment figures and number of recipients as best we could.

(B) We collated program lists, attempting to show the effects of the crust in each area of domestic activity.

V. THE HEARING

(A) Advance notice of the hearing was made in all local press, telling the public of the particulars of the hearing and the intention of the hearing.

(B) Witnesses were recruited from a list of recommendations made by both groups of volunteers. These included:

1. administrators of services—the director of a council on aging, an EEA director, a CAP director, a Model Cities director, a college president:

2. participants in services—a superintendent of schools, a different college president, a minister whose church runs several Federally-sponsored programs, a city mayor, a town manager; and

3. recipients of services—a college student, a financial aide, a labor official.

(C) A press package was given out at the hearings with a description of the specific local impact of cuts in all areas of federal domestic programs in our District.

VI. OBSERVATIONS

Many of the people you assume will know about the effects of the cuts don't. This is changing as more information is printed, as interest groups mobilize and as directives come down from the Government, but our work began the day after the Budget was delivered and no one seemed to know anything.

Many conversations must be held with people on the state level in state and federal agencies before you find people with information who are willing to do the hard work necessary to compile lists.

Volunteers* came from previous campaigns, from public interest groups, and from affected agencies. A great deal of staff work had to be done for the initial hearings. Three members of our staff and several interns worked on this both in Washington and Salem on a full-time basis for two weeks. Presently, volunteers are able to do a greater proportion of this work.

LINCOLN'S RELIGION

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, each Thursday morning a group of Members gather for the House of Representatives' Prayer Breakfast, from which we gain strength and inspiration. Many fine addresses have been given to the group by our colleagues. One of the most outstanding was recently presented by our colleague from Indiana, Congressman WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III, who is a student of the life of Abraham Lincoln. I would like to share with my colleagues Congressman HUDNUT's remarks on the religion of Abraham Lincoln:

LINCOLN'S RELIGION

(By Representative William H. Hudnut, III)

The irony with which a consideration of the religion of Abraham Lincoln might well begin is that while, on the one hand, he was the most profoundly religious President our country has ever produced, on the other, he maintained no affiliation with organized religion. This man who has been called "the spiritual center of American history" never became a church member!

There are possibly two reasons why Lincoln shied away from belonging to the institutional church. First, he found the Protestant sectarianism of his day very offensive. He was a broadminded tolerant individual who did not find 19th century denominational competition and theological dogmatism congenial. And secondly, he felt that the essence of authentic religion lay in ethics, not theology, in practice rather than preachment. The excessive stress in the churches of his day on confessional orthodoxy and creedal rectitude was distasteful to him, and he gave it a wide berth. He said that if he were ever to find a church that had inscribed over its altar the two great commandments to love God and neighbor as the sole qualification of membership, he would join that church; but needless to say, he never found it.

Perhaps it is just as well. While the New Testament makes it clear that for the average Christian, the full expression of his faith must be correlated with some form of institutional commitment within the framework of the Body of Christ, that is, the Church, Lincoln was no ordinary mortal. His disaffiliation is undoubtedly to his advantage, historically speaking, because it gives him

* It is essential that all of those working on the project understand the nature of the programs involved, No accurate information can be obtained unless the people asking the questions understand the substance of the information. This is extremely important and is much more difficult than one would assume.

a catholicity of spirit and universality of appeal that he might never have enjoyed had he carried a specific denominational tag. He was "a Christian without a creed," "a Biblical Christian."

What then can we say about Abraham Lincoln's "religion?" It may be instructive to think of it in terms of a great strong tree, composed of three parts: roots, branches (or fruits), and trunk.

THE ROOTS OF LINCOLN'S RELIGION

His religion had two roots: the Bible and prayer.

The Bible

Lincoln's speeches were not only steeped in Biblical phraseology, they also revealed that the man's whole way of thinking was Biblical. Of the Bible, Lincoln once said: "It is the best gift God has given to man." "Take all this book upon reason that you can, and the balance on faith," he said to his friend Joshua Speed in 1864, "and you will live and die a better man." Lincoln possessed an amazingly detailed knowledge of the Bible. He wove its thought and rhythms into the warp and woof of his state papers, as even a cursory reading of the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural make immediately and abundantly clear.

Prayer

The second root of Lincoln's religion was prayer. During his days in the White House as his trials continued and the pressures upon him mounted, and as his melancholy deepened, due to the loss of his precious son, Willie, and the continuation of the civil conflict that he abhorred, fellowship with God through prayer became increasingly a source of strength and guidance and comfort to him. He spoke publicly, without apology but also without ostentation, of his prayer life and of God's answers to his petitions. His secretary, John Nicolay, called him "a praying man." He prayed with his family and with his cabinet. He prayed alone every day. He once remarked to his friend, Noah Brooks: "I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go." And he also is reputed to have once remarked, "A man is tallest when he's on his knees."

THE FRUITS OF LINCOLN'S RELIGION

The fruits of Lincoln's religion, or the branches, were that part which could be seen and observed in the way he conducted himself. Looking at his life, at his attitude toward other people, at his relationships with enemies as well as friends, at the way he conducted the affairs of state, at the way he bore his private trials and tribulations, we must ask, did there ever live a public figure who better expressed the true spirit of Biblical religion than Abraham Lincoln? In his very perceptive study of Lincoln's religion under the title *The Almost Chosen People* (Doubleday and Company, Inc., New York, 1959), William J. Wolf concludes: "Lincoln expressed the fruit of Christian living with rare integrity and charm." (p. 180) At least five outstanding qualities of his character come to mind that show how he coupled what he believed with what he practiced.

Humor

First, there was his humor. He truly understood the relationship between faith and laughter, although he never lost his sense of ultimate seriousness about life and the meaning of existence. But he did not take himself too seriously. His wonderful sense of humor was a by-product of his ability to transcend self-interest, and he illustrates Reinhold Niebuhr's statement that "humor is a proof of the capacity of the self to gain a vantage point from which it is able to look at itself." Wit can help us keep our egos in perspective, and Lincoln often used it to deflate pride and deflect censoriousness. The more a man can laugh at himself and with others, the larger capacity does he seem to have for faith in God—and Lincoln knew this intuitively. He supposedly enjoyed (and even encouraged!) a story about him that went this way: Two Quaker women were overheard on a train dialoging as follows: "I think Jefferson (Davis) will succeed." "Why does thee think so?" "Because Jefferson is a praying man." "And so is Abraham a praying man." "Yes, but the Lord will think Abraham is joking." As another illustration of Lincoln's appreciation of the necessity for possessing a sense of humor, there is his remark to his cabinet when they did not see the humor that he saw in a passage he was reading them from Artemus Ward: "Gentlemen, why don't you laugh? If I didn't laugh under the strain that is upon me day and night, I should go mad. And you need that medicine as well as I."

Humility

Lincoln's use of humor suggests another characteristic of his religion and style of life—his humility. He was not puffed up. He never pontificated. He eschewed dogmatism. He held strong moral positions but always with modesty, never with arrogance. Blessedly divested of self-righteousness, he often mentioned his desire to serve as "a humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty." Constantly visited by people who claimed that the Lord was on this side or that in the Civil War, Lincoln would remark: "I'm not at all concerned about that, for I know the Lord is always on the side of the right. It is my constant anxiety and prayer that I and this nation should be on the Lord's side." Lincoln was free of the fanaticism that frequently accompanies and curses zealous religious idealism and excessive chest-pounding nationalism. He could see truth in positions other than his own. He appreciated that all human points of view are finite, all human positions tentative, all human achievements partial. Lincoln had the humility to submit his own judgments, as well as the course of his nation's destiny, to devine judgment. He was deeply sensitive to the "infinite qualitative difference" between God and man. So he spoke of America as "God's *almost* chosen people." He never fell into the trap of idolatry. He never made a god out of the nation.

Gratitude

A third characteristic of Lincoln's religion was gratitude. He had a marvelous capacity to be grateful. Paraphrasing a passage from the eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, Lincoln could say: "We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power, as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us . . ."

Lincoln knew how to thank men as well as God. He never took credit for himself. He always gave thanks for the hard work and sacrifice of the people and the soldiers who made the victories in the field possible. "It is hard to say anything has been more bravely and well done, than at Antietam, Murfreesboro, Gettysburg, and on many fields of lesser note. Nor must Uncle Sam's web feet be forgotten. At all the watery marshes they have been present. Not only on the deep sea, the broad bay, and the rapid river, but also up the narrow muddy bayou and wherever the ground was a little damp, they have been and made their tracks. Thanks to all. For the great republic—for the principle it lives by and keeps alive—for man's vast future—thanks to all."

Magnanimity

A fourth characteristic of his religion was his magnanimity. When Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts, toward the end of the war, spoke of Jefferson Davis in these words, "Do not allow him to escape the law, he must be hanged," Lincoln replied calmly, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." He was a man of tremendous compassion. He was too large of spirit ever to retreat into bitterness, vindictiveness or pettiness. Consider some of his most famous utterances:

"I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours, to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom." (His letter to Mrs. Bixby, who lost, so he thought, five boys in battle.)

"We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave, to every living heart and heartstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature." (The First Inaugural)

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." (The Second Inaugural)

Lincoln's love of neighbor so impressed Tolstoi that he could call him "a Christ in miniature." He was kindly, patient, forbearing and forgiving—all the things that every follower of Christ should be. He had a spirit of genuine charity toward his fellowman that excluded malice. "So long as I have been here," he said from a window of the White House to a group who serenaded him on his re-election, "I have not willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom."

Resolution

A fifth fruit of Lincoln's religion was his resolution. He had a courageous determination to proceed with the right course of action as God gave him to see it. He did not flinch. As one of his biographers says, "Lincoln represents the responsible Christian citizen of this world struggling to be responsive to the guidance of God amid the challenges of the full historic setting of man's life." (Wolf, *op. cit.*, p. 189) We need Christian saints like St. Francis, to be sure. But we also need Christian citizens like Lincoln who do not flee from the responsibilities of life to cultivate an individualistic piety or a mystical person-to-person relationship with the divine, but rather plunge with courage and faith into history's struggles for the realization of the ideals of peace on earth and justice among men. And so he could say to the special session of Congress in July, 1861, after the disaster at Bull Run: "Let us renew our trust in God and go forward without fear, and with manly hearts."

THE TRUNK OF LINCOLN'S RELIGION

Having mentioned the roots and branches in the tree of Lincoln's faith, it remains to discuss the trunk—that is, the essence of his religious interpretation, the backbone of his faith, the main content of his religious insight. What was it that held it all together? Briefly, we might suggest that Lincoln's religious thought was dominated by two overwhelming convictions: first, that history reflects the judgments and mercies of a transcendent God who involves himself with human events; and second, that in God's providential plan for mankind, democratic government "of the people, by the people and for the people" in general, and American democracy in particular, occupy a position of supreme privilege and responsibility.

The will of God

Lincoln had a prophetic understanding of history. He interpreted the whole epic of

America's pilgrimage in terms of God's providence. He believed with the prophets of old like Amos and Isaiah that the hand of God was intimately involved in the affairs of nations. He saw history, not as a series of disconnected secular events, but as the working out of a divine plan. He had a strong predestinarian faith that "the will of God prevails," and he believed that reliance on that will constitutes a nation's real strength. Like a good Calvinist he could say: "That the Almighty does make use of human agencies, and directly intervenes in human affairs, is one of the plainest statements in the Bible. I have had so many evidences of His direction, so many instances when I have been controlled by some other power than my own will, that I cannot doubt that this power comes from above." As Professor Wolf suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 158), when in one of his famous remarks Lincoln said, "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history," he might well have been saying, "We cannot escape God," for what he meant was that history is controlled and determined by God, and that it is futile for man to oppose His plan. Lincoln was convinced that "the American people and the President were instruments in the hands of the God of history."

Consequently, Lincoln never tried to play God. He suffered no Messianic or titanic illusions. He had no egotistical feeling of being the master of his fate and the captain of his ship. As he saw his task, it was to discern the signs of the times, discover God's will for himself midst the turmoil of his day, and then implement it as best he could. He did this in bad times and good, and when things began to get better, he could still caution: "Still let us not be over-sanguine of a speedy final triumph. Let us be quite sober. Let us diligently apply the means, never doubting that a just God, in His own good time, will give us the rightful result."

American democracy

Lincoln related American history and democratic government to God's providence. He spoke of America as "this favored land," and of the founding of our country as "a great promise to all the people of the world to all time." With almost mystical vision, he referred to democracy as "the last best hope of earth." He believed this form of government was deeply rooted in the will of God, and when he spoke in his Gettysburg Address of "this nation under God," he pointed clearly to the moral foundations and spiritual dimensions of democracy.

Beyond that, he believed that in a democracy, God spoke through the voice of the people as it expressed itself in majority rule and representative government by consent of the governed. His familiar aphorism about being able to fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time, but not being able to fool all the people all the time, hints at his great confidence in the power of the people to make wise and right decisions. So he said in a speech in Buffalo, New York: "I must trust in that supreme Being who has never forsaken this favored land, through the instrumentality of this great and intelligent people."

Lincoln believed that America was, in Professor Wolf's words, "a chosen nation destined to further God's plan for mankind." (*op. cit.*, p. 149) Tapping the wellsprings of the American religious tradition rooted in the 17th century Puritan conception of New England as God's new land of promise, and anticipating the concept of manifest destiny that propelled American expansion in the decades following his death, Lincoln eloquently articulated the American dream of "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Under God's guiding hand, such a nation could not help but have an important rendezvous with destiny. The trial through which the nation was passing in the Civil War put this faith to a critical test, but Lincoln believed that the nation, under God, would emerge from its agony with a new birth of freedom. God's purpose would work itself out in this civil conflict, and America would move forward into history proving that "government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

This was Lincoln's hope. He did not live to see it fulfilled. Perhaps it never was, and never will be. But it was a great vision he saw, a great cause he espoused, a great faith he held. And if we, a century or more later can learn from him, we will become better Christians and better Americans as a result.

OEO ARTICLE IN U.S. NEWS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the March 5, 1973, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a most interesting article on the subject of poverty in our society today.

I include this article in the RECORD:

WHY "WAR ON POVERTY" IS BEING SCRAPPED

The old way of fighting poverty is over—branded a failure by the President. That, he says, does not mean federal aid to the poor is being abandoned. What it does mean is a major change in combat strategy by the White House.

The ambitious and far-reaching "war on poverty" declared by the late President Johnson is now being scrapped by President Nixon as a failure in its present form.

In the eight years since this "Great Society" program got under way, it has cost the Government almost 15 billion dollars, reached millions of people, employed thousands of administrators.

It has fallen far short, however, of eliminating poverty. And it has been plagued from the start by disappointments and controversy.

Now its scheduled dismantling is stirring new controversy. The President's action is under bitter attack from "liberal" lawmakers, welfare organizations and social workers.

A mass demonstration of protest drew about 20,000 to the capital on February 20. A fight to save the antipoverty operation is brewing in Congress.

Many fronts. The war on poverty was never a single, centralized program. It was a war of battles on many fronts. One program after another was launched with great fanfare and high hopes. There were, among others:

The Job Corps.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Operations Head Start and Follow Through.

VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America).

Community Action agencies.

Legal Services for the poor.

Neighborhood health centers.

Programs for Indians and for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Dispute swirled about almost every program. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the command center for most of the war's operations, underwent many changes and a succession of commanders. Programs were spun off, cut and altered.

Finally, in his new budget for the 1974 fiscal year that begins on July 1, President Nixon axed out the entire Office of Economic Opportunity. It is being dismantled.

Many of OEO's programs will be transferred to other federal agencies and continued—on some form, at least. A few of these will actually be given increased funds. Others will get less. Some will be allowed to die.

One of the most widely known of OEO programs—Community Action agencies—is to be abandoned as a federal enterprise. There are now 907 such agencies employing more than 180,000 people and spending about 1.2 billion dollars of federal money a year—a third of which came from OEO. Communities which want to continue those agencies beyond June 30 will have to do it on their own, without aid from Washington.

Legal Services for the poor are to be continued, under the Nixon plans. But legislation will be sought to set up a new agency to run them.

Changed strategy. What all this adds up to, as Administration officials describe it, is not an abandonment of efforts to combat poverty, but rather a new strategy for waging the war. The way it has been waged in the past, they say, it has not proved worth its cost.

President Nixon explained his reasoning in a nationwide radio speech on February 24.

"The intention" of those ambitious social programs launched in the 1960s "was laudable," he said. "But the results, in case after case, amounted to dismal failure. . . . Too much money has been going to those who were supposed to help the needy and too little to the needy themselves."

Defending his budget proposals in another speech February 21, he said:

"It has been charged that our budget cuts show a lack of compassion for the disadvantaged. The best answer to this charge is to look at the facts. We are budgeting 66 per cent more to help the poor next year than was the case four years ago; 67 per cent more to help the sick; 71 per cent more to help older Americans, and 242 per cent more to help the hungry and malnourished. Altogether, our human-resources budget is nearly double that of four years ago when I came into office.

"We have already shifted our spending priorities from defense programs to human-resources programs. Now we must also switch our spending priorities from programs which give us a bad return on the dollar to programs that pay off. That is how to show we truly care about the needy. The question is not whether we help, but how we help. By eliminating programs that are wasteful, we can concentrate on programs that work.

"Our recent round of budget cuts can save 11 billion dollars in this fiscal year, 19 billion next fiscal year, 24 billion the year after. That means an average saving of $700 over the next three years for each of America's 75 million taxpayers."

Hard to assess. The results of the war on poverty, it is generally agreed, are most difficult to assess. As the chart on this page shows, the number of "poor" people, as defined by federal standards, declined somewhat during the prosperous years of the 1960s. But then, with antipoverty spending continuing at even higher levels in a period of economic recession, the number of the poor began to inch up again.

There is hot dispute over how much of a factor the poverty war has been in any of these changes. Its defenders claim it has helped in many ways, including some that do not show up in statistics. Critics disagree.

"I don't think that the program in the OEO had any very direct result in reducing poverty generally," says the new Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Caspar W. Weinberger, who was Director of the Budget when the decision to dismantle OEO was made.

Howard J. Phillips, 32-year-old acting director of OEO who is supervising its dismantlement, gave "U.S. News & World Report" this assessment of the agency's effectiveness:

"Some of the projects funded by this agency have kept a lot of people comfortable in their poverty—but this agency has not done enough to lift people out of poverty.

"Many of the things it did had negative impact. Some grants tended to foster the welfare ethic, rather than the work ethic. Some programs were premised on a belief that the problems of poverty are political rather than economic. It is wrong to give taxpayers' money to some of the people for seeking political solutions.

"Too much of the antipoverty money has gone into setting up an administrative bureaucracy, rather than into the hands of the poor. It is questionable whether the agency-system approach really helps the poor."

The counterattack.—Defenders of the poverty-war program have begun a nationwide campaign to keep it going. At the February 20 demonstration in Washington, there was talk of "marches on 50 or 60 cities" unless Mr. Nixon responds to the demands.

The demonstration was sponsored by a coalition of civil-rights groups calling itself the Mobilization for Domestic Unity. Speakers included the widow of the Negro leader, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, who led a "poor people's march" on Washington in 1968.

On February 20, mayors of several big cities—including San Francisco, Boston, New Orleans and Newark—appealed to Democratic leaders in Congress for help in trying to reverse the Nixon cut-down in antipoverty and other programs.

The coming fight in Congress will pit some powerful members of both parties against President Nixon.

Senator Jacob K. Javits (Rep.), of New York, and Senator Gaylord Nelson (Dem.), of Wisconsin, have proposed a "sense of the Congress" resolution that the President should continue OEO and its programs.

These Senators pointed out that Mr. Nixon signed into law last September a bill extending the life of the OEO until June 30, 1974, and they argued that he cannot legally dismantle it sooner without legislation from Congress.

"What has been established as the policy of the United States, enacted by the Congress, should not be undone by executive action alone," said Mr. Javits.

"A cease-fire at home." Sounding a note that is likely to be heard often in congressional debate, Senator Nelson said:

"It is bitterly ironic that after waging war for years in Southeast Asia—a war which Congress never declared—this Administration now proposes a cease-fire in the war on poverty here at home. . . .

"And, while abandoning the poor in rural areas and poverty-stricken inner cities here at home, the Administration is proposing a 7-billion-dollar program to rehabilitate the countries of Southeast Asia."

Critics charge that the strategy of the Nixon Administration is to rush through the dismantling of OEO before Congress can act to stop it.

Although the OEO itself is scheduled to go out of business on June 30, many of the things it has been doing will be continued by other agencies, under the plans of the Nixon Administration.

Some examples:

Community Economic Development is to be shifted to the Office of Minority Business Enterprise in the Commerce Department, with its funding increased by 2.6 million dollars, to 39.3 million.

Health and nutrition programs, including the neighborhood health centers, will go to the Health, Education and Welfare Department, with spending to be cut from 157 million dollars to about 147 million.

Programs for Indians will also be put under HEW, with spending to go up by 9.7 millions, to 32.1 millions.

Aid to migrant and seasonal farm workers now handled by OEO will be continued by the Labor Department, with a requested appropriation of 40 million dollars—up from 36.3 million.

Research and demonstration projects will be parceled out to various other agencies, but total funding will go up by 11.3 million dollars, to 78 million.

A number of OEO programs had been spun off to other agencies in years past.

The Job Corps, for example, was transferred to the Labor Department in 1969, and then trimmed down.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps also went to Labor, with some local projects continued.

The Head Start program, giving preschool training to disadvantaged youngsters, and the Follow Through program for disadvantaged first graders had been shifted to HEW.

In 1971, the VISTA program was put—along with the Peace Corps and some other "volunteer" agencies—into a combined group known as ACTION.

Some phasing out. OEO activities scheduled to be phased out include: training and technical-assistance projects, a national summer program of youth sports, and emergency food and medical services.

Perhaps the loudest cry of protest is being raised against the scheduled demise of the 907 Community Action agencies.

The aim of these agencies was to help the poor to help themselves and to generate community participation in action against inner-city blight.

Supporters of the CAA program claim it has enhanced "upward mobility" of members of minority groups and mobilized local resources to help the poor.

A study made but not published by OEO is cited as showing that Community Action agencies helped raise 1.3 billions to aid the poor, of which more than half was nonfederal money.

Acting OEO Director Phillips charges that CAA grants of federal money have been used to provide "patronage for local cadres of political activists."

Community Action agencies, he points out, have been in frequent conflict with elected local governments.

The Legal Services program also has been a center of controversy. It employs 2,300 lawyers who are supposed to represent poor people with legal problems not involving crimes.

Target: the system? Critics charge, however, that it has gone beyond its intended purpose and spent much of its resources in attacks on "the system." Says Mr. Phillips:

"Some of these lawyers who are paid with federal funds have taken the view that their mission is to change the fabric of society through law reform. They have brought class-action suits, challenges to constitutionality of laws, suits to put more people on welfare. They have organized rent strikes, done lobbying, aid political-action groups. They have organized prison inmates, helped peace organizations and the gay-liberation movement, and have represented ineligible clients.

"All this is not helping the poor—it is purely political."

Although the Nixon Administration has announced it plans to continue Legal Services under new management, there is sure to be a battle in Congress over the kind of management that is proposed. The aim of Legal Services backers will be to keep supervision by Washington—to a minimum and assure that lawyers serving the poor are left free to represent the best interests of their clients.

Whatever the outcome of the battles over OEO that lie ahead, this much is clear: Some big changes are coming the way the Federal Government tries to help the poor.

"TROUBLED WATERS"

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the White House will dissasociate itself at once from the recommendations of the National Water Commission for the imposition of navigation user tolls on our inland waterways and for local and regional funding of future flood-control and river improvement projects.

Both ideas, set forth in a recent report of the presidential commission, would create, if augmented, great hardships on western Pennsylvania and other sections industrially dependent on river navigation. Indeed, they could so weaken the Pittsburgh-Allegheny County district as to end its position as a leading steel-producing area.

I quote Louis P. Struble, Jr., group vice president for the Dravo Corp.:

> The institution of tolls on the Mississippi river system would mark the first step in the exodus of the steel industry from this (the Pittsburgh) area.

Steel mills were located along the rivers originally because of the low-cost water transportation which they needed in order to prosper. It was a natural industrial decision and river barges from the beginning have been busy freely moving materials to the furnaces and products away from them. To break up this arrangement now by charging for river usage would invite an industrial disaster which all the Nation would suffer.

It seems to me that now should be the time to encourage rather than threaten with revolutionary concepts the steel industry which is trying its best to stave off the damaging effects upon it of the growing volume of steel imports.

The recommendation for local and regional financing of flood-control measures is equally illogical. This has been an historic Federal responsibility on the grounds that the benefits of river improvements cannot be isolated for local areas but are of national in scope. There can be no sound reason to change this now and thus to invite chaos in the continuing flood control effort.

Dr. Marvin J. Barloon, economic adviser to the Ohio Valley Improvement Association and a professor at Case-Western Reserve University in Cleveland, pointed out recently that the water commission, named in 1968, is heavily stacked with far westerners. Charles F. Luce, chairman of Consolidated Edison Co., New York, is the only easterner on the board. None is present from the Mississippi drainage basin which extends over the heartland of the country. Could it be that the commission does not understand what could be the consequences of its recommendations, so easily tossed off for the public?

The White House ought to make it clear that, although presidential in sponsorship, the commission is sailing recklessly into waterways certainly should not be troubled, now or in the future.

VFW'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students partcipated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

"My Responsibility to Freedom," theme for the VFW's 26th annual Voice of Democracy scholarship program, focuses the attention of youth on the principle that freedom is a responsibility and not a license. It calls upon the youth of America to make a personal evaluation of their responsibility in preserving our freedom heritage.

The winning speech from the State of Georgia was delivered by K. Thomas Grenier of Tucker. At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues the speech written by Tom Grenier:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By K. Thomas Grenier)

To define freedom in its entirety would be difficult if not impossible in a speech such as this, even if the speech were entitled "A Definition of Freedom". So let us just say that freedom is being able to do what you want to do and say, in whatever form, what you want to say.

Realizing what I do about human nature and the fact that man tends to stretch anything that's for him until it's against him, I must contradict myself immediately. Rather, perhaps, you will contradict me.

You will say that there are many nations that claim to be free, and this is all well and good, but these people do not live in freedom as I have defined it. In fact, you add, there are laws in each and every one of these so-called "free" nations which limit what these people can say and do.

"Indeed," I reply, "but this does not necessarily mean that my definition should be changed, does it?

All right, look at it for a minute; rather, look at man. Is it not true that man as he lived, say, toward the fall of the Roman Empire was unhappy? In general he was depressed and either mean or oppressed. What else was true? He was free. There was a lack of control to be found in the Roman government. But how did man take this? He took it as an opportunity to do things that were against previous laws and which were morally wrong and hurt others with less likelihood of being caught or punished.

This we have seen, and yet there are still those today who have freedom and use it in just such a manner."

You immediately agree that this is wrong.

"But," you say, "man should be free to do that which is wrong as well as that which is right, should he not?"

I do agree, but on the other hand, there should be something that shows him, without a doubt, which is the better road, and truly makes it obvious which is his only choice.

My responsibility to freedom is to prove to as much of mankind as is humanly possible that there is something to direct him and that he should heed it for his own sake.

To clarify my point a bit, and I do believe it warrants some clarification, I shall come to it from a different angle.

My pointer or guide is a being referred to quite often as God, so if I may incorporate God into all this, and I do feel He should be considered in this responsibility of mine, or, if I may be so bold, ours, I believe that God saw, or even made, the need for man not to take freedom as a thing to squander on ills. In other words, man is born to be unhappy if he uses freedom against himself or his contemporaries.

This is all that man's written laws have to say but they should not have to be written. They should be obvious; no one should have to make them so.

Think about it—your and my biggest responsibility is to make sure that we live and help others to live rightly, not because we will get arrested if we don't, but because we realize that it is the only way that we could want to live.

We want to accomplish more toward true improvement and true elevation of mankind than has been achieved. In the past, we have evaded our responsibility. Our responsibility to freedom is as simple as this. We are free to do the right thing. We must do it.

MINNEAPOLIS PROTESTS HUD FREEZE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's decision to freeze all new commitments for HUD-assisted housing programs and to impose a moratorium on model cities and other urban renewal projects is creating serious difficulties for our cities. My home city of Minneapolis is among those municipalities which will suffer from these regrettable policies.

Recently, the Minneapolis City Council passed a resolution urging HUD to lift the freeze and moratorium. I support this resolution which follows:

RESOLUTION

(By Aldermen Sivanich and DeMars)

Urging the Federal Government to lift the freeze on assistance for housing programs and the moratorium on categorical grants in aid and to enact a community development revenue sharing program

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis has a workable program for community improvement to eliminate slums and blight and to provide standard housing for low and moderate income persons; and

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis is dependent on certain categorical grants in aid to implement the workable program for community improvement; and

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis is dependent on HUD assisted housing programs to provide housing for low and moderate income persons; and

Whereas, the Federal Administration has implemented a freeze on all new commitments for HUD assisted housing programs including the section 235, 236 and public housing programs; and

Whereas, the Federal Administration will impose a moratorium on programs of HUD including Model Cities urban renewal, code enforcement, Section 312 loans, parks and open space facilities, and other categorical grants in aids; and

Whereas, such a moratorium will have adverse effects on living conditions of citizens of low and moderate income, and will severely affect Minneapolis' community development activities; and

Whereas, the moratorium will have noticeable impact on the housing industry and employment opportunities in Minneapolis; and

Whereas, an adequate sharing of revenue by the Federal Government for community development would assist in alleviating such adverse effect; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis:

That the Federal Administration is urged to lift the freeze on new commitments for HUD assisted housing programs; and

That the scheduled 18 month moratorium on categorical grants in aid be suspended at the earliest possible moment; and further

That the Federal Congress is urged to speedily move to enact a community development revenue sharing program.

Passed February 9, 1973. Richard M. Erdall, President of the Council.

Approved February 15, 1973. Charles Stenvig, Mayor.

Attest: Lyall A. Schwarzkopf, City Clerk.

BUREAUCRATS: THEIR OWN BIASED JUDGE AND JURY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in Roll Call, the weekly familiar to all those on Capitol Hill, cited two cases in which Federal employees dared to rock the bureaucratic boat by citing objections to policies, practices, and bungling damaging to efficient Federal service. On quite a few occasions I have cited the case of John D. Hemenway, the selected out Foreign Service officer, whose 4-year fight with the State Department ended with an apology to him for unfair treatment but no reinstatement which he had sought. In the other case, that of A. Ernest Fitzgerald, who protested the cost overruns on the C-5A cargo plane, the fight for justice has also been long and arduous.

Allan C. Brownfield, who has viewed the scene here in Washington for a number of years as a lawyer, author, and public speaker, recounted in brief the Fitzgerald and Hemenway cases and the uphill battle faced by Federal employees who refuse to be manipulated marionettes in the face of Federal abuses.

I insert at this point the Brownfeld article as it appeared in the March 1, 1973, issue of Roll Call:

BUREAUCRATS: THEIR OWN BIASED JUDGE AND JURY

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Recently, two employes of the federal government were removed from their positions. The reason for their removal remains obscure, but one thing is certain. They were not removed for incompetence. If men and women were removed from government service for incompetence, after all, the mail might arrive on time, criminals might be caught, and other functions of government might be performed at least with reasonable dispatch.

John D. Hemenway was removed from his position at the Department of State and A. Ernest Fitzgerald was removed from his position with the Air Force, it seems, because they did their jobs too well, and made their superiors suspicious because they would not adopt the maximum which seems the byword of bureaucrats, as well as legislators: "To get along, go along." John Hemenway and Ernest Fitzgerald would not "go along." Now they are gone.

Fitzgerald is the Air Force cost analyst who told Congress about the $2 billion in cost overruns on the Lockheed C-5A cargo plane, and was subsequently fired from his $33,000 a year job. The Pentagon insists that Fitzgerald's testimony had nothing to do with his firing, which was "merely a reduction in force."

A reporter asked President Nixon about the Fitzgerald case on January 31, and the President replied: "I was totally aware that Mr. Fitzgerald would be fired or discharged or asked to resign. . . . No, this was not a case of some person down the line deciding he should go. It was a decision that was submitted to me. I made it and stick by it."

The President's surprisingly frank reply was, of course, retracted the next day. White House Press Secretary Ron Ziegler told reporters that the President had "misspoken." He had been thinking about someone else, Ziegler said, but did not say about whom.

Perhaps the President was thinking of John Hemenway, a former Rhodes Scholar who had been deeply involved in the Berlin problem during the mid-1960s and, at that time, had strong differences of opinion with his superiors. For his efforts, Hemenway was "selected out" of the Department.

When Hemenway charged that his own hard-line anti-Communist philosophy was the real reason for his "selection out," he was given a special grievance hearing—the first in the history of the Foreign Service. The grievance committee was composed of three Foreign Service Officers—one picked by Hemenway, one picked by the State Department and a chairman acceptable to both.

The committee wrestled with the problem for three years and finally in September, 1972, recommended that Hemenway be reinstated in the Foreign Service, promoted, tendered an official apology, and reimbursed for his legal expenses.

Hemenway, however, has not been reinstated. Instead, he has been dismissed from the Defense Department job he was given while the case was being considered. When The Secreary of Defense Eliot Richardson was asked about Hemenway's removal at a press conference, he said he knew nothing about it. He may have been right. If he was, however, someone must know something about it. No one, however, is talking.

In Hemenway's view, the Foreign Service is an "old boy" network where the rules are kept deliberately vague and constantly changed in order to accommodate favorites, but ruthlessly applied to get rid of people who make waves.

A 1968 inter-office memo to then-Director of Personnel Howard Mace from his subordinate Donald Trice reveals what the State Department thought of Hemenway. Rather than criticizing his ability, his hard work, and his creditable performance, Trice wrote that Hemenway was destined to end up here being "a pain in someone's bippie," and that the reason Hemenway had not been promoted despite his good performance was that Hemenway was "confident to the point of being arrogant and aggressive in a manner that approaches rudeness." Rhetoric aside, that may simply mean that Hemenway's defense of positions he considered in the best national interest simply struck Trice as something the Department of State could do nicely without.

The unbelievable part of the Hemenway case is that the State Department's own committee urged his reinstatement, the Department apologized for treating him unfairly—but refused to reinstate him anyway.

Senator William Proxmire has seen a close analogy between the Hemenway and Fitzgerald cases. These cases demonstrate, he noted, "that there is little room in the Government service for men of character, independence and guts . . . that the Government doesn't want the free spirits—the highly intelligent, strong minded, truthful men—working for it. What it wants instead are time-servers, conformists and 'yes' men."

Bureaucrats, at this time, are their own judge and jury. Men such as John Hemenway and Ernest Fitzgerald make "waves," they criticize the judgment of their superiors, they believe that the public interest is more important than the self-interest of the bureaucracy. What to do with men like this is simple: remove them.

Speaking of his ten years in the Departments of Commerce and Labor, Arnold Bennett stated that, "There is a fantastic effort to keep criticism off the record. You can't admit error. It's just not done. You can't ever talk freely about what you really do—that would be a direct threat to the agency's appropriations and to everybody there. And you can't really have your name on anything controversial."

Congress is largely responsible for the state of affairs in which bureaucrats have become a law unto themselves. Harold Seidman, who spent 25 years observing the bureaucracy from the Bureau of the Budget, has written a book called Politics, Position and Power, in which he says that bureaucratic bodies provide examples of how Congress transfers its own overlapping powers to the Executive branch.

He notes that, "When jurisdictional problems could not be resolved, the Congress in 1966 created two agencies—the National Highway Safety Agency and the National Traffic Agency—to administer the highway safety program. The President was authorized to designate a single individual to head both agencies. All that was gained by creating two agencies—where only one was needed—was to give two Senate committees a voice in the confirmation of the agency head."

Consider the United States Travel Service, a Commerce Department program funded over the years at between $3.5 and $4.5 million. It is designed to attract foreigners to vacation in the United States. "We did a study of the Travel Service," said Fred Simpich, general counsel of the Commerce Department in the last year of the Johnson Administration, "which showed that it had a zero effect on the travel patterns of Europeans . . . If the economy is good, they come to the United States. If not, they don't." Bureaucrats never admit that their programs accomplish nothing, but cost a great deal. Any bureaucrat that did would go the way of John Hemenway and Ernest Fitzgerald, and men at the highest levels would not say a word in their defense.

A bill to take the entire grievance procedure out of the hands of the State Department, to cite one possible approach to the problem, passed the entire Senate, only to die in the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee. Perhaps the House will see fit to consider this legislation again this year.

Bureaucrats can no more judge themselves and be their own jury than can any other branch of government. Men who speak out in behalf of the public interest—such as John Hemenway and Ernest Fitzgerald—are ruthlessly eliminated. Congressmen seem unconcerned with this problem, and when they wonder why government is as sluggish, expensive, and incompetent as it is, they may discover that it is their own fault for not policing and controlling it. In the meantime, John Hemenway and Ernest Fitzgerald are unemployed, and no one seems to care.

GODSPELL'S MESSAGE STILL RUNNING AT FORD

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, from the moment we hear our first lesson until the day we end our lives, we have been taught to follow the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, or what may be called the "spirit of Christianity." But looking at the people, the world, and the insanity around us, I am amazed at how many times we humans have failed to connect the words of our Greatest Teacher to our everyday lives.

The tiny theatrical miracle called "Godspell," now in our midst at Ford's Theatre, is deserving of praise for its entertaining and effective attempt to re-inject the brotherhood of Christianity into our daily experiences. But because "Godspell," its creators, its cast, and Ford's Theatre have exceeded every previous conception of theatrical influence and involvement, we owe them our special congratulations and thanks.

In a world still riddled with violence, hatred, and opression, "Godspell" can yet convince us that mankind can prevail with its most powerful and simple weapon: love—love of God, love of each other, and love of ourselves.

This utterly delightful and beguiling musical romp is based both on the text and the spirit of the Gospel of St. Matthew. With parables abounding, the reassuring message of Jesus Christ comes to vibrant life with the humor and music of both today and yesterday. The humanity and warmth of Christ and his his philosophy are resurrected by young author John-Michael Tebelak and composer/lyricist Steven Schwartz. Their creative talents have sparked to life a message which many had considered dead and forgotten.

In a religious sense, the essence of Christianity is now being theatrically thrust forward in "Godspell." But as Life magazine noted, it is done, "with no loss of reverence and no odor of sacrilege." Author Tebelak began "Godspell" as his educational thesis intended to "revitalize people's interest in religion and bring more celebration into religion." Success is reflected in his creation which makes the New Testament alive, relevant, and joyous. The nihilistic "God is Dead" philosophy of only a few years ago is now itself dead. "Godspell's religious validity was authoritatively embraced by the respected Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsay, who witnessed "Godspell" with tears in his eyes, and remarked that the song "Day By Day" was the most moving experience he ever had because "It's the way I pray."

But the success and worth of "Godspell" go far beyond religious measurements. Our own split society may find reason to move back together again as the result of an experience such as "Godspell." The Catholic Review noted that:

> Godspell may have more of a good influence upon our alienated young people than we realize.

This move toward reunity was a prime objective of Mr. Tebelak. He said:

I think that one of the ways Christ was trying to teach us to find love between each other was to look for a part of ourselves within each other.

"Godspell" successfully creates an emotional bond between any generation gap in a burst of brotherhood, embracing people of every age. Tom Prideaux, critic for Life magazine, observed:

The show's power is not just that it preaches Christian doctrine, but that it actually creates a festive, spontaneous love-thy-neighbor mood . . . it is a family show. Young people especially respond to its frolicsome spirit and grasp its essential truths.

St. Matthew's lessons here are not aimed at anyone, but for everyone. No one is to blame for where the world is, but anyone can help get it straight again. Richard Lebherz noted in the Maryland Post that:

There is something quite gentle about "Godspell." It accuses nobody, but seeks to instruct, in charming ways, what the teachings of Jesus are all about . . . it will certainly leave a constructive impression.

"Godspell" not only offers a possibility of bringing us all back together in a spirit of community, but it even goes so far as to offer us all hope for the future. One walks away from the performance feeling cleansed and thinking there is a chance for the world and man. For "Godspell" shows us that weakness, not some inherent evil, man's basic flaw. And weakness is a flaw that we as a people can overcome.

Finally, "Godspell" must be commended as a champion of the individual. It leaves behind a joy for the common man; an idea that it was a Christ of the people, and not of the thrones, who once lived. "Godspell" is a celebration of the simple and the pure. Its sense of forgiveness and comfort cannot help but ease the burden of any man.

All of this praise would merely be an appendage to "Godspell's" critical success if it were not for its sense of community. All of theatre now talks of community involvement; but it is quite another thing to transform an idea into reality. Ford Theatre's production of "Godspell" has been a model of local involvement and assistance. Together, "Godspell" and Ford's have held benefits for: the inner city children of Washington, St. Steven's ministry, the Washington Community School of Music, the D.C. Institute of Mental Hygiene, the National Retinitis Pigmentosa Foundation, Washington's Public Broadcasting Service and many others. Further, the cast of "Godspell" have given generously of their time in going out and entertaining the Children's Hospital, the Heart Association's parties for Heart Surgery children, and countless other visits of charity. And Ford's Theatre has broken records for aiding school groups, community organizations, and theatre parties in their arrangements of "group attendance and assistance." Such a record could put most community aid centered groups to shame.

It has only been a few years now, that the Ford's Theatre Society and the U.S. Department of the Interior's National Park Service combined to both continue an historical landmark and simultaneously sponsor an operating theatre, alive with the spirit of the old and the new. In consideration of Ford's record of recent theatrical productions under Executive Producer Frankie Hewitt, and its recent activities with "Godspell," we can look at the Government's sponsorship of Ford's Theatre as one of our most profitable investments.

I believe that the present production of "Godspell" and the active involvements of Ford's Theatre demand our attention and sincere thanks and admiration. All factors considered, both "Godspell" and Ford's are respectfully carrying on the spirit of the man who gave this particular theater its heritage and history.

THE GOOD AND THE BAD

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the forced busing of schoolchildren is an issue that has gained a great deal of attention throughout the country.

Currently in Arizona's First Congressional District there is a situation involving the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's attempts to solve a numerical racial imbalance. I speak of Tempe Elementary School District No. 3 and the children of Guadalupe.

Guadalupe is a small community consisting primarily of Mexican-American and Yaqui Indian citizens who mostly speak Spanish. The children attend a school in Guadalupe, which is part of the Tempe school system. According to HEW, these children are not properly spread throughout the Tempe schools.

The Tempe situation highlights many of the problems created by forced busing, but more than the others it points out the language barrier faced by the minority children involved.

In order to provide these children true educational opportunity, a sound, effective bilingual educational program is necessary. Practical and fiscal problems preclude such a program from being carried on in all the schools throughout the District. Yet, HEW tell us that without desegregation there is discrimination against minority students.

To support this position HEW looks to the 1964 Civil Rights Act. However, I think the department is unduly bound by their own narrow definitional reading of that Act. In this case applying HEW's quotas and formulas frustrates the needs of the people who are to be helped.

In this situation there is the potential for a very real and destructive type of discrimination, and that is language discrimination. What would be more discriminating than for a child to be forced to attend a school where his language ability would jeopardize his learning, and isolate him from his classmates?

We must broaden our perspectives in considering what needs to be done to combat discrimination effectively.

The March 7, 1973, Wall Street Journal editorially commented on the Guadalupe situation. That editorial follows and I recommend it to my colleagues:

THE GOOD AND THE BAD

Once upon a time it was relatively easy to tell the good guys from the bad guys. Good guys, to read much of the national press at any rate, were those who favored a strong presidency, massive federal spending, numerous social welfare programs, bountiful foreign aid and, more recently, forced busing to achieve racial integration in public schools. Bad guys stubbornly opposed those enlightened prescriptions.

Now many one-time good guys are trying to curb the power of the presidency. They claim foreign aid has largely benefitted the ruling class. Brookings Institution scholars have noted the failure of massive federal spending programs and, as The Washington Post recently reported, even social scientists who just a few years ago were eager to transform society have doubts about the effectiveness of the social programs they so freely advocated.

That leaves only forced busing, which is opposed by almost every segment of American society at every educational, economic and geographic level—and by just about every politician, especially at election time. Nevertheless, a dwindling number of supporters, particularly among the media and the judiciary, continue to view commitment to busing as the dividing line between morality and immorality.

It would be interesting, then, to hear them explain the motivations of the Guadalupe Organization, an antipoverty group comprised of families from the tiny, impoverished migrant worker community of Guadalupe, Ariz., just outside Phoenix.

The overwhelming majority of Guadalupe's residents are Mexican-American and Yaqui Indians; of the approximately 600 students who attend its lone elementary school, 91% are Yaquis or have Spanish surnames. Yet the Guadalupe Organization says it will go to court if necessary to prevent busing of its children to other schools in the district outside Guadalupe—a possibility that seems inevitable in view of a recent HEW order that the Guadalupe school be desegregated to comply with racial-balance requirements.

There have been many other examples of minority resistance to busing solely to promote racial integration. A federal court order in the summer of 1971 would have required half of Chinatown's 3,000 elementary school children to ride buses to schools in other parts of San Francisco, so parents organized community schools where their Chinese heritage could be taught and preserved. Black parents in New York City have decried busing their children across town.

What this means is that if forced busing is moral, Guadalupe's Yaqui and Mexican-American parents, San Francisco's Chinese parents and NYC's black parents are immoral—even, perhaps, racist, since that has been the contention of most pro-busing advocates.

It could be, on the other hand, that these minority parents object to seeing their children used as pawns in social engineering games with uncertain benefits. And it also could be that the views of the overwhelming majority of other busing foes are not far different.

CHARLES R. JACKSON

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that Mr. Charles R. Jackson, head of the Criminal Investigations Bureau of the Westchester County Sheriffs

Department in New York, is going to be retiring from this position.

In his 20 years of police work, Mr. Jackson has distinguished himself as one of the outstanding criminal investigators, particularly in the field of narcotics.

Over his lengthy career he has been repeatedly honored and praised by those in his profession. While my friend Charlie will be leaving the law enforcement field he will be continuing to work with young people to help them in problems dealing with drug abuses.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to call these facts to your attention so that you and Members of the House can join me in extending to this distinguished gentleman our congratulations on a job well done and our best wishes to him in the future.

DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was recently announced that Dr. James P. Wesberry, acting chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives during the summer of 1949, was named 1972 Man of the South and elected to the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" by Dixie Business magazine. This announcement was made by Hubert F. Lee, the founder and editor of Dixie Business since 1929.

Dr. Wesberry, who has served as pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta for 30 years, is well known nationally for his work as a Southern Baptist minister.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the release forwarded to me by Mr. Hubert F. Lee after the announcement of this award to Dr. Wesberry. The release follows:

Dr. James P. Wesberry, who begins his thirtieth year as Pastor of Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, well-known nationally prominent Southern Bapist minister, is the 1972 Man of the South and elected to the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" by Dixie Business Magazine, as announced by Hubert F. Lee, the founder and editor of Dixie Business since 1929.

Dixie Business, according to Editor Lee, "seeks to honor men who have contributed conspicuously to the South during their lifetime, so they personally may derive some satisfaction in knowing their work has been appreciated by their contemporaries."

A special citation and award will be presented to Dr. Wesberry at the Eleven O'Clock Worship Service of the Morningside Baptist Church Sunday, March 4, which marks the 29th anniversary of Dr. Wesberry's pastorate and the beginning of his thirtieth year. While many ministers have held long pastorates in Atlanta, Dr. Wesberry holds the honor of serving longer currently than any other known minister.

In announcing this Award Lee pointed out that Dr. Wesberry holds many honors. He said that as a college student at Mercer University Dr. Wesberry received the highest honor given at the hands of the Student Body and Faculty, that of Master Mercerian; that Dr. Wesberry holds four honorary doctor's degrees; that he has served for twenty years as Chairman of the State Literature Commission; was Vice Chairman and Chairman of the Editorial Committee of the Governor's Citizens Penal Reform Commission in 1968; served for six years as a member of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention; was President of the Georgia Baptist Convention and the Southern Baptist Pastor's Conference; and served as President of the Atlanta Christian Council and Moderator of the Atlanta Baptist Association.

Lee said Dr. Wesberry is now serving for the third time as a Trustee of Mercer University and had served on the Board of Trustees and Administration Committee on the Atlanta Baptist College since its creation. He also pointed out that Dr. Wesberry is a member of the Executive Committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention and was Chairman of its Administration Committee for four years.

Dr. Wesberry's life and influence has extended, said Lee, to the far corners of our nation and world. Dr. Wesberry was Acting Chaplain of the United States House of Representatives during the summer of 1949 during the 81st Congress while his son, Jim, Jr., who later served for five years in the Georgia State Senate, was a Page. Lee said he believes that Dr. Wesberry knows intimately more Governors, Congressmen, Senators, and has known more Presidents of our nation than any preacher in the South. Dr. Wesberry's Prayers were published by the Congress and Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, said: "His daily ministrations were helpful and inspiring, lifting all who heard him to a deeper realization of their need for divine guidance.

Dr. Wesberry is also one of the Scottish Rite lecturers and holds many Masonic honors. He served as Grand Chaplain of the Grand Lodge of Georgia during the administration of Grand Master George P. Whitman. On January 17, 1973 he received the Merit Award from Yaarab Temple. Tom Slate, Past Potentate, in presenting the Award, said that Dr. Wesberry "is the first to be appointed to that position (Chaplain of Yaarab Temple) by five consecutive Potentates and that he has served for seven of the past ten years and has been recently reappointed for 1973. Dr. Wesberry is the first Christian minister to ever receive the Merit Award from Yaarab Temple since it was instituted in 1923.

Dr. Wesberry is the author of a number of books. His newest book, "Meditations for Happy Christians," has just recently been released by Broadman Press. In writing about Dr. Wesberry Broadman Press says: "Few men become living institutions, but James P. Wesberry is one of those few. In 1944 he began a pastorate at a congregation of slightly over 500 members in Atlanta, meeting in a small wooden building. That congregation today is the Morningside Baptist Church, one of the great churches of America." "His extensive writings," Broadman Press says, "includes several books and frequent contributions to secular and religious periodicals. Truly, he is an amazing man, an embodiment of the faith proclaimed in this book."

In making this award, "The Man of the South," Hubert Lee said, we also took into consideration that Dr. Wesberry is a true and patriotic citizen of the old South. Dr. Wesberry's grandfather for whom he is named "Pickett" fought in the Confederate Army. Dr. Wesberry was born in Bishopville, South Carolina, in the beautiful cotton and Bible belt section of his beloved Southland and was reared and received his early schooling in Columbia, a city which, like Atlanta, was destroyed by Sherman. From there he has gone to the far corners of the earth.

Dr. Wesberry has been on many preaching missions for the Chief of Chaplains of the United States Air Force and also traveled extensively in other lands.

Dr. Wesberry also moderated for many years the popular "This Is Your Town" interview television program and has appeared often on many other television and radio programs.

While the pulpit is his throne and he takes great pride in being a pastor who really loves people, his number one joy and honor is that of being Pastor of Morningside Baptist Church. In 1943 he was called to one of the largest and most influential city churches in America which had more members than there were people in the town where he was pastor, but Dr. Wesberry says, "The Lord called me to Morningside and to Atlanta, and if there has ever been a man who was called of God to preach, I am that man; and if there has ever been a happy pastor, I am that pastor because I know I am where the Lord called and wants me. Dr. Wesberry has, across the years, led his people from a small frame building on Highland Avenue to what he refers to as his dream church, one of the most beautiful in the nation, an architectural gem located on a fourteen and a half acre wooded, hillside site overlooking Atlanta's skyline, estimated in value today at over two million dollars, one of the most influential among Southern Baptists.

Dr. Wesberry has seen the skyline of Atlanta change during the almost three decades that he has lived in Atlanta, and he and Mrs. Wesberry love Atlanta, think it is the most wonderful place on earth in which to live, love, and serve, and every day he gives thanks to God for the great and glorious privilege of seeking to magnify Jesus Christ and of serving the people.

This is the man Dixie Business is proud to present as "The Man of the South for 1972" and to its "Hall of Fame for the Living."

A HOPE FOR PEACE AT WOUNDED KNEE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the latest reports from Wounded Knee, S. Dak., truly concern me. Since efforts for a negotiated settlement have broken down it is urgent that steps be taken to avoid the violence that has been promised for tonight. Both sides, of course, must cooperate if bloodshed and a direct confrontation are to be avoided.

The situation, however, is highly volatile. Two hundred U.S. marshals and FBI agents reportedly are in the vicinity with automatic weapons, tear gas, and armored personnel carriers. The Government clearly has more weapons than the Indians, and I truly hope that restraint is shown at this crucial time. Today, in fact, I called the Justice Department urging their caution in this area.

It is clear that the Indians have been an oppressed minority in this country for a very long time. On the other hand, it is my belief that the Indians might modify their demands and at least agree to talk to Marvin Franklin, Chief of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Only through a dialog between representatives of the Bureau and the Indians can agreement be reached; a confrontation of arms will result only in a tragic loss of life.

Wounded Knee, the site of the 1890 massacre is a shrine of Indian martyrdom. How refreshing it would be if this same site could now be changed to become a symbol of mutual understanding and respect.

TRAGEDY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent series of Middle East tragedies could lead a casual observer to conclude that the situation is going from bad to worse and that a recurrence of the violent outbreaks which have studded the history of that unfortunate land may be imminent. All this may come true, but I believe it is too soon to tell. And, despite recent tragedies, I believe there is reason to be hopeful.

Most recently, the Black September terrorists killed two American diplomats and one Belgian in the Sudan in a wanton and barbarous act. The purpose of this atrocity seems to have been to secure freedom for several Arabs who have been convicted of capital crimes in Jordan and the United States. In other words, the purpose was to replace the legitimate rule of law with anarchy.

Such a tendency has plagued the Arabs for decades, and only recently have some Arab leaders begun to realize that yielding to the guerrillas, the terrorists, and those who would achieve their ends through blackmail serves only to destroy Arab unity and condemn the Arabs in the eyes of the world.

King Hussein has steadfastly refused to yield to terrorist demands that he release those who instigated the civil war in Jordan in September of 1970.

Libya's Col. Muammar al-Qaddafi has resisted the demands of extremists that the Arab world seek revenge against the Israelis for shooting down a commercial passenger plane causing the death of more than 100 people.

The Sudan's President Jafaar al-Nimeiry also has dealt with these atrocious tactics firmly in the past. In the summer of 1971, an attempted coup in Khartoum resulted in the execution of the rebel leadership. Now President Nimeiry has pledged to bring the eight guerrillas who shot the diplomats to justice.

That is more than good news for the Americans and Belgians affected. That is good news for the Arabs, and especially for peace and stability in the Middle East. The Arabs can no longer afford to waste their energies fighting one another. President Nimeiry was right when he stated that the guerrilla takeover of the embassy was a plot to embarrass his government and to display the weakness of the Arab nation generally. So far, President Nimeiry has refused to show that weakness. No leader, unless he rules by totalitarian means, can prevent the irrational attacks of terrorists. But by condemning such attacks when they occur and punishing those who perpetrate them, a leader may reduce the likelihood that they will be repeated.

There are those who do not believe that President Nimeiry will be able to make good on his pledge and that the eight terrorists will eventually be let loose to prey upon the world again. Only time will tell, of course. However, if the courage which President Nimeiry has displayed in the past is any guide, then he will make good on his pledge and the Middle East will be a safer place to live.

TRANSFER FROM TARRANT COUNTY JAIL TO FEDERAL INSTITUTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke in this chamber about the continued incarceration of a constituent of mine, Thomas Laffey, in the Tarrant County Jail, Fort Worth, Tex.

At that time, I renewed my request to the Department of Justice that Mr. Laffey be transferred to a Federal facility so that he might, at the very least receive the type of treatment that is afforded to convicted Federal criminals. As I have stated previously, Mr. Laffey has not been charged with any crime, nor has he been convicted of one. He is currently in jail for his refusal to answer certain grand jury questions, a decision which resulted in the civil contempt charge under the Organized Crime Control Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that the Department of Justice has responded to my call and has ordered the transfer of Mr. Laffey to a Federal facility in the Fort Worth area. Following my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the text of a letter which I have just received from Mr. Laffey describing the much more tolerable conditions at the Federal Correctional Institution at Seagoville.

There are still a good many questions surrounding this grand jury inquiry in the northern district of Texas and I am pleased to note that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG) has scheduled a judiciary subcommittee meeting for next Tuesday to probe the current status of this inquiry as well as its original purpose and intent. I am sure that a number of my colleagues will be joining me in presenting material to the subcommittee for its deliberations and will be following the hearing record closely.

The letter follows:

SEAGOVILLE, TEX., *March 4, 1973*.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: By now, I am sure you have heard that we have been transferred from Tarrant County Jail to Seagoville Correctional Institution.

It came as a complete suprise to us, we had no idea that we were going any place. It was 3 p.m. on last Wednesday when the guard told us we were being transferred here.

It is still jail, but it is a big improvement from where we were. The food is much better and we get to go outside for an hour everyday. We also get to go to church on Sunday.

I just got finished talking to ——— and she told me that you would have a Congressional Hearing on our case. I want you to know that all of us deeply appreciate all you are doing for us.

Very Sincerely,

DANNY CRAWFORD.

P.S.—We are glad to have left that hellhole. We are lucky that our minds are still intact. I wouldn't wish that jail on any human being.

AID PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAMS TO COMBAT INTERNATIONAL CRIME AND TERRORISM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic atrocities of the past few days at Khartoum have shocked the sensibilities of the civilized world. As we decry the wanton murder of these innocent victims of international blackmail, two of them career American diplomats, we call upon all nations to join in the immediate search for solutions to this mad wave of terrorism.

Our State Department has warned all diplomatic posts to be alert to the possibility of similar incidents in their areas, for acts of blackmail, once successful, tend to feed upon themselves. This had been amply demonstrated by the increasing number of abductions of diplomatic hostages during the past several years.

The police forces of most host countries are solely responsible for internal security, including the protection of foreign diplomats. In many developing nations the police are ill equipped to cope with the type of international banditry spawned by current world problems. Lack of even basic effective communication capability, force mobility and training in counter-terrorists techniques has contributed to their frustration and ineptitude. Subsequent reliance upon military forces has frequently compounded the problem through overreaction and the abandonment of democratic processes.

With the increasing complexity and sophistication of the world's technology, there has been a corresponding increase in international crime. Along with illicit narcotics trafficking, now the world is faced with "international terrorism."

We in the United States must take a strong position against international crime. The place to start dealing with this problem is at the early stages with the development of an effective and responsible police force in the developing countries. We cannot be the world's policeman nor should we. We cannot enforce laws in foreign countries without becoming embroiled in war. But, we can help the foreign police officer to do his job more professionally and effectively.

Military assistance programs for developing countries have recently come under strong review, due to their high cost and the dangers of undesirable U.S. involvement. U.S. assistance programs for civil police forces however are low cost, and are directly related to correcting deficiencies in communications, training and professionalism which inhibit performance against international terrorism.

Public safety programs, operated by AID, are in 19 countries of the free world. Recent impartial studies disclose that these programs are meeting both their immediate and long-range objectives. They have not only resulted in improved performance and professional stature of the police, but in the building of institutions and practices which should continue progress after U.S. assistance is terminated.

In some developing countries police radio networks have been installed which not only serve law enforcement needs but meet the requirements of the central government. Facilities for professional training have been developed in numerous countries. Identification bureaus and crime laboratories have been created or improved through modern equipment and trained personnel, which has greatly reduced traditional reliance on confessions and inhumane methods of interrogation. The objectives of this program have been to: First, improve the capability of the civil police to maintain public order with a minimum use of force, second, encourage the development of responsible and humane police adminstration, and third, enable the police to become responsive and more closely integrated into the community.

The International Police Academy, an integral part of the Office of Public Safety, recently graduated its 4,358th student since its creation in 1963. These graduates, representing 75 countries worldwide, now occupy command and supervisory positions in their respective departments, and in many cases, have been instrumental in effecting needed organizational changes, better leadership, and improved attitudes of public service. In addition to traditional police subjects, specialized courses in narcotics suppression, bomb handling and airport security have been offered, to name but a few.

It is axiomatic that where good internal security exists, with the police capable of controlling lawless violence, the climate for lawful protest and political development is improved. Uncontrolled violence and terrorism, however inspired, frequently cause governments to react defensively, and to establish, oppressive restrictions on all forms of protest. Similarly, in the administration of justice, an atmosphere of peace and order tends to encourage more humane treatment of criminal offenders.

In the search for countermeasures to the wave of terrorism which recognizes no civilized restraint or geographical boundaries, it would be expeditious to consider the expansion of a successful ongoing program. No one is suggesting or in any way advocating that any one country attempt to police the world. It is possible, however, for the United States to help through assistance which would combine the advantages of both low cost and low profile with the expertise of a trained staff of skilled advisers.

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST OLDER AMERICANS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the impact of last year's Revenue Sharing Act amendments, including the stipulation that required 90 percent of these limited funds finance services only for those actually receiving cash welfare benefits, continues to hit hardest at the already overburdened elderly poor.

One of the most serious results of this legislation is the threatened suspension of many ancillary service programs that are badly needed by citizens who are not on welfare but who may be eligible for such assistance.

It has been brought to my attention by the Reverend Donald Yost, director of the services for the aging of the Lutheran Service Society of Western Pennsylvania, that clients of his organization's 16 meals-on-wheels programs face severe hardships because of this legislation.

Mr. Yost points out that of the 600 persons served, only between 60 and 70 are actually receiving cash welfare assistance. This means that 90 percent of his clients will be ineligible because of the 90–10 limitation.

Second, Mr. Yost points out that because of the proposed regulations disallowing use of private funds as part of the State share, their private contribution of $33,000 will not be eligible for use in their contract with the State. If this is the case, the program will be forced to end when that contract expires in 3 months.

I have introduced legislation that would stipulate this 90–10 limitation not apply to the elderly, disabled, or blind. Hopefully, many of the anticipated problems would be averted. I am presently circulating a letter to my colleagues for added cosponsors in an effort to rectify this limitation of services for those not on welfare, some of whom refuse to accept welfare.

I would like to share with my colleagues the text of a statement and an actual case history of one couple provided by Mr. Yost that point up the very real need for Congress to act at once to protect nonwelfare recipients:

FACT OR FALLACY? 1973

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."
—*The New Colossus*,
Emma Lazarus, 1903.

America would have a difficult, if not impossible, task of proving these words true or meaningful to a large segment of its elderly poor. Like it or not, there is a vast desire on the part of a large number of Americans to have the elderly poor just fade away and be forgotten.

The Federal government seems bent on adding to the already over-burdened elderly poor of America. First, the severe cutbacks in funds for delivery of human services, then the requirement that the elderly must be cash recipients of Public Assistance to receive supportive services, and now the requirement that private funds cannot be used as "local share."

What is the Federal government trying to accomplish? Prove by not caring for the elderly that the elderly will disappear? That by the 90% cash recipient ruling that the elderly will be forced *onto* or *off of* Public Assistance? Is the Federal government dedicated to the task of divesting the elderly of what little they have left—human dignity and self-worth? What is the Federal government trying to do—increase the Federal and State tax burden by ruling private funds ineligible as "local share" money?

The Federal government *cannot* provide delivery of human services for the elderly without *private* social service agencies which utilize *private* funds, unless the Federal government is willing to add additional billions to the public tax load.

For example: The Lutheran Service Society of Western Pennsylvania operates a network of sixteen (16) Meals-on-Wheels programs in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. Recently a study revealed that it would cost government at least $500,000.00 to provide ten meals per week to the six hundred (600) clients. In addition, it should be noted that of the six hundred (600) Meals-on-Wheels clients in Allegheny County *less than seventy* (70) are cash recipients of Public Assistance.

If the people of America were to receive a gift from a grateful foreign nation in 1973 could the words inscribed on the Statute of Liberty be inscribed there with honor and integrity? Is there a place for the poor in America today?

The elderly poor cannot wait for the slow process of Congressional redress of current inhuman treatment. What is the answer? What would the President and members of Congress have us say to the poor—especially the elderly poor?

Could the words of Emma Lazarus, written in 1903, and inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty, be inscribed there in 1973? Do the words even have any vague meaning for the elderly poor in 1973?

THE COOPERS—A CASE HISTORY

Mr. and Mrs. Cooper—Albert and Pauline—are invalids who have lived, in their own words, by "helping each other." Mr. Cooper is a stroke victim. He uses a walker. He is unable to speak, and communicates by gesturing. Mrs. Cooper is restricted to a wheelchair. She is a diabetic, paralyzed several years ago by nerve damage from a misplaced insulin hypodermic. She also has a bowel involvement, possibly cancer.

Mr. and Mrs. Cooper, both in their 70's, are Meals-on-Wheels clients. Until recently they were on public assistance, but now with Federal changes, their Social Security allowance is higher than the limit for public assistance cash recipients, so finances have been curtailed.

As recently as the end of January, Mr. and Mrs. Cooper were still able to cope in their daily existence, poor as it was. Supportive of one another's needs, they had little more than this to depend on, with the exception of the meager help social services agencies provided. Shunted aside by their children, who claim no responsibility for them, the Coopers lived for and through each other.

A Pittsburgh television documentary on the subject of aging depicted the Coopers as poor, but with at least some vestiges of human dignity left. In that film, Mrs. Cooper was quoted as saying "A bad day is when it's gloomy, and there's no mail, and no company comes, and then the pains get worse. A good day is when the sun shines and the Meals-on-Wheels people come."

The film seemed almost a downward turning point in their lives. During the week of its broadcast, on two consecutive days, volunteers took Mrs. Cooper to a hospital for a lower gastro-intestinal series of X-rays, and on the second day, a barium series. On her return from the hospital the first day, Mrs. Cooper commented to a volunteer, "Oh my, I didn't realize how run-down and dilapidated my house is. Someone should have told me how bad it looks." It was the first time in three years Mrs. Cooper had seen the outside of her home.

Alone at night now, Mrs. Cooper has begun talking about being admitted to that hospital herself. She also speaks on suicide. The one last dream the Coopers had, to live out their lives together, is ending.

With funding and an adequate staff, this situation would not have been corrected, but at least, temporary solutions and stop-gap measures might have been afforded the Coopers, supporting them and attempting to keep them at home and together.

The depression set in more deeply; Mrs. Cooper began to listen when visitors talked to her about signing papers to have Mr. Cooper admitted to a county institutional hospital.

During the following week, a series of events occurred which marked a nadir in the lives of the Coopers.

Mr. Cooper fell against a bedroom stove, badly burning his arm. During a cold snap that same week, water pipes froze and burst. The Coopers were not only without water, they also had a flood on the bathroom floor. The problem was referred to the city since the house in which the Coopers live is a condemned property owned by the city. Plumbers were sent in. Five days later there was water available in the kitchen, but none in the bathroom. The bathroom floor was still under water.

Mr. Cooper's arm became infected. He was taken to the hospital for emergency room treatment. Social services at the hospital admitted him instead, due to his generally poor condition. Mrs. Cooper was contacted about having him admitted to the institutional district hospital. Mrs. Cooper agreed; the papers were signed and as soon as a bed becomes available, Mr. Cooper will be transferred.

IN PEACE MAY I WAVE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as I have for the past 2 years, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the original and delightful poems of a group of fourth graders, from the John Minadeo School, in Pittsburgh.

Miss Roberta Feldman, their teacher, has helped the class develop this book of poems, about our American flag, dedicated to our brave astronauts and entitled "In Peace May I Wave."

Each year, following the appearance of these poems in the RECORD, I receive several letters from people all across the Nation telling me how much they appreciate the originality and youthful patriotism evidenced in the poems.

I am sure this year will be no different. The poems follow:

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 5, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: The fourth graders of the John Minadeo School, again have created a poetry booklet of original flag poems. The topic of this booklet is our true feelings about the flag.

We hope you will take a moment of your valuable time to read "In Peace May I Wave."

We dedicated this booklet to our astronauts whom we are very proud of.

Respectfully,

ROBERTA FELDMAN.
SUSAN BLOCK.

IN PEACE MAY I WAVE

(By Roberta Feldman)

The American flag, be it waving in the United States or on the moon symbolizes peace, justice, and freedom for all mankind.

As Americans we can be proud of our astronauts who planted Old Glory on the moon. Americans have come a long way since our humble early beginnings in 1775.

The fourth graders of the John Minadeo School wish to dedicate this poetry booklet to the Apollo 17 Astronauts Eugene Cernan, Harrison Schmitt, and Ronald Evans, America's last astronauts on the moon in this century.

We salute you. Our flag flies hopefully in the spirit of peace.

"May the Spirit of peace in which (we) came be reflected in all mankind"—E. Cernan.

MY FLAG

(By La Verne Hunt)

What the flag means to me
Is more than it seems
Through the perilous fight
It survived through the night
Our soldiers fought for their freedom
It means much to me
More than it seems
For the Red, White, and Blue
Yes, I love you

OLD GLORY

(By Bradley Wong)

Old Glory flies very high,
Except when someone important dies
For then she is flown at half-staff.
When the weather is bad
Our American people are sad
Old Glory is taken down.
But, proudly she stands,
Looking oh, so grand
Symbolizing liberty and peace for all.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By Nancy McNelis)

The red and white stripes on the field of blue
Flew day and night
Free and true,
The flag flew ragged and torn,
Our men were forlorn
This sight filled the British with scorn,
It's thirteen stripes and many a star
Have stayed through the Revolutionary War.
Through the perilous fight,
Both day and night
No more a small tag
But our nation's flag.
"And the Star Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

OUR FLAG OF WAR

(By Samuel Kramer)

One night,
I saw a perilous fight
All the soldiers heard the bombs,
The flag flew in front and behind,
Dripping from mud, and tattered and soiled,
Our flag flew in the sky very bold.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

(By Francis Coyle)

The Star Spangled Banner
The flag that is true,
At Fort McHenry what flag stayed there?
The Star Spangled Banner which we hold dear,
The Star Spangled Banner with red, white, and blue
A flag which will always be true,
It stands for freedom, bravery too,
The Star Spangled Banner with its red, white, and blue.

OUR FLAG

(By Jon Kronzek)

The red, white, and blue
It is so true
Betsy Ross made it,
Just for you
The bombs came through
But we knew it was going
We hoped and hoped
Through the gleaming night, we saw our flag
The flag of the United States of America.

OLD GLORY

(By Ivan Waldman)

Old Glory is its name
It's lived through lots of history and fame,
The enemies' guns and the bombs bursting in air
But to our surprise the flag was still there.
We have struggled through this day,
So the whole world will say
Freedom is here
Let's stand up and cheer!

OUR FLAG

(By Marie Mullin)

As I was going by,
I looked up in the sky,
I saw Old Glory our flag waving high,
Let's keep our country free
Old Glory waving high
We feel happy
But sometimes we think of the war,
Our eyes are lowering
We're sad
When we think of war
Bombs, bombs, bombs.

OUR FLAG OF FREEDOM

(By Steven Nickel)

Our flag is very bright,
When it glows through the night
Our flag stands very high,
You would think it's in the sky.
You see it flying left and right
Up and down all around—
It never falls on the ground—
At flag raising we don't make a sound.

OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By Quentin Bullard)

Our flag represents our country
It is our freedom's symbol,
Francis Scott Key thought we lost the battle,
Then he saw our flag still there
Our true Star Spangled Banner.

OUR FLAG OF LIBERTY

(By Erin Wikes)

Our flag of red, white, and blue,
Represents liberty to you,
For all mankind
It represents freedom
Our flag symbolizes war
The faces of man, and his family galore
Wars are bad for me
Our flag means new liberty

OUR FLAG

(By Tammy Heller)

Our flag waves triumphantly
Through the cool air
It stands for freedom
On the moon and everywhere
None would dare
To hurt our flag
With weapon or hand
That so boldly waves
Throughout the land.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By Andrew Luterman)

'Tis the flag of liberty
'Tis the flag of peace
It's the symbol of independence
Oh long may it wave
Over the home of the brave.

RED, WHITE, AND BLUE

(By Paula Fingeret)

Red, white, and blue,
we'll always remember you
You'll wave through the day,
You can wave silently
Or you can wave loudly
Wave through the sky
Or wave through a cloud
Red, white and blue,
Everyone loves you!

IT STOOD TALL

(By Lisa Netzer)

We thought it would fall,
But it stood very tall
It was up through the fight
And all during the night
We thought it was out
Yes, out of sight,
But were we right?
No, our flag stood tall.

OUR FLAG

(By Maureen Kolocuris)

I have a little flag
That's blue, white, and red.
Listen very closely
I'll tell you what I said
If you're proud of our country,
If you're proud of our land
Raise our American flag
High as you salute it with your hand

OUR REPRESENTATIVE

(By Harry-Todd Astrov)

It stands for good,
It sets down bad. At morning it goes up,
At night it goes down.
That's what makes us proud.
It stood through the Battle of Baltimore,
Our flag never went down.

OUR FLAG

(By Stacy Tozzi)

Our flag is red, white, and blue
It was made for all people like me and you
It symbolizes freedom, an idea we all love
Our American flag, so great we do love.

OUR FLAG

(By Kris Eshghy)

The flag has three colors
Red, white, and blue
When our astronauts went to the moon
Old Glory was planted there too
The red, white, and blue are called Old Glory
The Stars and the Stripes in our history
Helped to make the American Story.

THE LONGEST NIGHT

(By Susan Block)

Oh say can you see
Were the words of Francis Scott Key
When he watched through the night
As the American soldiers did fight
The red, white, and blue always proved true
Oh, red, white, and blue.

OUR FLAG

(By Rebecca DeMatteo)

Oh hail to the flag of red, white and blue
With fifty stars and thirteen stripes
They are so grand in the night
So beautiful when you were made by Betsy
Ross
Oh so beautiful, oh so grand
How we love you
Oh, red, white, and blue.

OUR FLAG

(By Michele Aarons)

Our flag is the famous flag that stood so tall,
I hope it still stands and never falls
It was made by Betsy Ross with red, and
white stripes
The stars on a background of blue never fall
That's why it's the most famous flag of all.

THE PERILOUS FIGHT

(By Michael McCarthy)

When the ships moved in,
Someone had to win,
When they started to fight
The flag stayed up day and night
The flag bore many a hole
When it was on McHenry's pole
Now we are free
As all Americans can see

OUR FLAG

(By Debbie Lewis)

Our flag is red and white on a field of blue
Our flag flies for justice and will always be
true
Our flag means to be loyal for you
Our flag means to be brave for you
Our flag will always wave
The flag will always wave in a sky of blue
It waves in the hearts of all Americans too.

THEE OLD GLORY

(By David Perl)

As Francis Scott Key peered from a boat
He looked at other boats a float
He saw in the distance a flag hanging limp
Was it British or American, he puzzled!!
As a strong wind lifted it
He said "It's Old Glory"
It stands tall—Old Glory, Old Glory.

OUR FLAG

(By Bruce Markowitz)

Our flag flies tall and free
For every boy and girl to see—
If you count the stars there are fifty too
And thirteen stripes colored red, white, and
blue.
Our flag stands for justice and peace for you
and me—
Many men fought to keep it free
We salute the flag and feel very proud
We say the Pledge of Allegiance clear and
loud.

OUR FLAG

(By Paula Tomasovich)

People fought to save our flag
With their bruises and clothes of rags
Through the day and night
To save our flag they did fight.
Across the river sat Francis Scott Key
Waiting quietly for the flag to see
Is it still there?
Is it still flying in the air?
It is still there!
It is flying in the air
They saved our flag,
They saved our flag.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By Lori Leff)

The blue of our flag stands for uniforms
That the soldiers did wear
The stars stand for bombs
That went bursting in air
The red stands for Blood
That many did die
The white stands for freedom which we
slowly won—
The flag is full of liberty with lots of glory
too—
That's why our flag means much to me and
you.

OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By Kathryn Dobbs)

The first flag was made by Betsy Ross,
The stars were white and the stripes ran
across
When Francis Scott Key discovered the flag
was still there,
He wrote the National Anthem which is now
sung everywhere.

WHAT OUR FLAG IS

(By Paul Walsh)

The United States fought hard for the flag,
When we were done fighting it was a rag
I think the flag is the best
All over the whole wide world,
The colors red, blue, and white
Do so shine in the night.
The flag means freedom to me
It's important for all to see.

OLD GLORY

(By Susan Puglin)

The red, white, and blue,
Old Glory is our flag
That stood so proudly through the night
It was still there
So proudly waving.

OUR FLAG

(By Sharon Lehman)

Our flag is red, white, and blue,
It stands for our country so true
I hope it is so great to you
Our flag, so pretty with those colors waving,
Wave, red, white, and blue.

OUR GREAT FLAG

(By Kim Wallace)

Every time I look at our great flag
I think of that great fight
What a sight!
We really fought
Our flag still stood tall
It was tattered and torn
That did not matter—
It stood tall.

OUR RED, WHITE, AND BLUE FLAG

(By Angelo Lamenti)

Our red, white, and blue flag stands for
peace,
It waves over our land,
It is out of sight when we see it in the
air,
It is our Country's flag.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By Caroline Barrett)

The flag stands for freedom and liberty too
Oh yes, red, white, and blue
The red stands for blood, which the soldiers
bled,
The white is for purity and cleanliness too—
The blue is for uniforms which were worn
by many men—
The stars are for the bombs bursting in air—
The stripes of our flag fly for liberty too
Oh, Stars and Stripes, we love you.

OUR FLAG

(By Anna Marie Tarasovic)

Our flag is so nice
It is so very good,
People look at it each day.
In a very special way

OH RED, WHITE, AND BLUE

(By Michael Smith)

Oh red, white, and blue
We all love you
You stand so very high
Up in the sky,
Your colors so bright
They stood there all during the fight.

THE FLAG

(By Colleen Broderick)

I love the flag it's red, white, and blue
It shows our freedom for both me and you
Betsy Ross made the first flag out of her skirt
Our flag is on the moon now
There it will always stay.

MY FLAG

(By Susan Stein)

My flag has just fifty stars and thirteen stripes,
It stands for justice, peace, love, and brotherhood.
I care for our flag
The flag of today, the flag of tomorrow.

THE RED, WHITE, AND BLUE

(By Michelle Rubanoff)

The red, white, and blue,
It has always been true,
It flew all through the night,
To win every fight,
Oh, red, white, and blue.

MY FLAG

(By Craig Castiglione)

My flag is bright
With thirteen Stripes
Men have carried the flag through the night
And prayed by dawn's early light.

OUR FLAG

(By Marcie Slotsky)

Our flag has three colors
They are red, white, and blue
If you know what they mean,
They will be important to you.
Our flag stands for freedom, justice, liberty, and peace,
The man who wrote our anthem was Francis Scott Key
He wrote our song of liberty

RED, WHITE, AND BLUE

(By Jimmy Goldstein)

Oh red, white and blue,
What do they mean to me
The red is for blood, so much has been shed,
The blue for uniforms of men lying dead,
The white for the clouds that hung in the sky
Our flag flies high, high, high.

OUR FLAG

(By Jennie Connell)

Betsy Ross made the first flag
But it started out as a gag,
Our first flag was called the red, white, and blue,
Everybody just loved it too.
If everybody likes our red, white, and blue—
Everybody would surely like you our flag too.

OLD GLORY

(By Arthur Quinn)

The stars on our flag on a field of blue
I am sure it will tell you
Many things about our country
Our flag, our flag it is so true.

OUR FLAG

(By Mark Malakoff)

Our flag is red, white, and blue,
It shines for justice and for you.
It shines all day and then all night
It's big waving red and out of sight.

OUR FLAG

(By Linda Dusch)

With dignity they stand,
The men of our land
They died for our flag
Which we never, never drag.
The bombs light the air,
As dawn will soon appear
The flag stood there at night
With the brave restless men as they fight.

OUR FLAG

(By Ellen Grobstein)

Our flag is bright
Our flag is bold
Our flag has stripes
Yes, they are very old.
Our flag to us means more
Than three pots full of gold
Because all through the cold
Men fought so bright and bold.

OUR FLAG

(By Debbie Gelman)

It stayed up all night
Through the war and the fight
We thought it was gone
But it was still flying strong—
Through the burst of the bombs,
Our flag flied calm.

OLD GLORY

(By Thomas Grove)

Old Glory, Old Glory with your stars and stripes,
Flags and flags of different types
Flags from England, Spain, and France
Old Glory's the best always, first or last
It flies at half staff,
On different occasions
Old Glory, Old Glory, Old Glory.

COMMUNISM IS NO CHOICE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it was once said that no free people would ever forfeit their individual freedom in favor of State control and totalitarian domination by voluntarily voting themselves under communism.

Judging from the recent elections in France, Chile, and West Germany, we must recognize an exception to the rule. Unless the alternative political parties have so compromised their position and identity that they express "me too-ism" to communism and the people have no choice except labels, in desperation people without a choice will vote for communism if for no other reason than thinking they may get a change.

I include several related newsclippings to follow:

[From the Evening Star and News, Mar. 5, 1973]

ALLENDE COALITION GAINS SEATS

(By Merwin K. Sigale)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—The coalition supporting President Salvador Allende picked up several new seats in yesterday's election, turning back a bid by the moderate-conservative opposition to expand its majority control of congress.

While retaining control of both houses of congress, the opposition failed to win the two-thirds strength it had hoped to achieve to impeach the Marxist leader or at least be able to overturn presidential vetoes.

"It's a triumph for Chile, for its institutions, for Democratic coexistence and public freedoms," Allende told the nation on television late last night.

"The country has spoken clearly and definitely to tell the present government that it does not accept its program," insisted former President Eduardo Frei in a speech from the balcony of his Christian Democratic party headquarters early today.

There were late-night victory rallies by both sides on the Alameda Bernardo O'Higgins, Santiago's main boulevard, and police and troops fired round after round of tear gas to keep the opposing groups apart.

ADDITIONAL SEATS

By then, official but incomplete returns had made it clear that the opposition had kept its majority hold on Congress, but that Allende's six-party Popular Unity coalition had picked up additional seats and proved that it still has a popular base of support despite the serious economic problems that beset the country.

With less than half the votes reported, the over-all tally in the Chamber of Deputies races showed the opposition, grouped as the Democratic Confederation, with 759,371 to 630,144 for Popular Unity, which is dominated by the Communist and Socialist parties.

The percentages were 53.6 to 44.5 with a splinter party and invalid ballots accounting for the rest.

TOPS 1970 PERCENTAGE

Later returns were expected to diminish the Popular Unity percentage, but it appeared likely to exceed 40 percent—better than Allende's pre-election forecast and a rise from the 36.3 percent he received in the 1970 presidential race. He won that over two candidates of the then-divided opposition.

Unofficial estimates were that the governing coalition picked up two Senate seats and 7 to 10 in the Chamber of Deputies. Before the voting, the combined opposition held margins of 32–18 in the Senate and 93–57 in the Chamber. All 150 Chamber seats were at stake but only half of the 50 Senate seats were.

Frei, the Christian Democrats' leading hope for the presidency in 1976, was elected to the Senate from Santiago Province. So was Sergio Onofre Jarpa, chairman of the rightist National Party, which joined the left-of-center Christian Democrats and three splinter parties to mount a unified challenge.

A MAJORITY ANYWHERE

The opposition's victory claim was summed up by Frei in his balcony speech. He said 51 percent represents the majority opinion of any country, and therefore Allende and his Socialist program had been repudiated.

But Allende noted that his coalition had reversed the usual downtrend of ruling parties in midterm elections.

It was more certain today that the opposition's slogan of "reconstruction"—a euphemism for halting or rolling back the march toward Socialism—would find no sympathy in La Moneda, the presidential palace. Allende already had said he would not change his program, no matter what the electoral outcome.

In fact, the election had little practical result. The opposition majority in Congress was simply reduced, suggesting that the stalemate between the executive and legislative branches might continue to the end of Allende's six-year term, unless there is some accommodation with the Christian Democrats.

SLOWED, NOT STOPPED

That stalemate has slowed but not stopped Chile's drift toward Socialism, which already finds the government controlling half of national production, compared with 20 percent when Frei turned over the presidency to Allende.

Two prominent Marxists were re-elected to the Senate yesterday. They are Carlos Altamirano, secretary general of the Socialist party and its chief exponent of a tougher policy line, and Volodia Teitelboim, a member of the Communist party Central Committee who supports Allende's softer approach to fundamental change.

Among the incumbents defeated were Sen. Julio Duran and Sen. Raul Morales, both of the right-wing Radical Democracy party. Duran has been a presidential candidate. Morales was implicated in the rightist conspiracy that led to the assassination of army Gen. Rene Schneider shortly before Allende took office. A court subsequently upheld Morales' legislative immunity.

[From the Evening Star and News, Mar. 6, 1973]

LEFTIST COALITION IN FRANCE TIGHTENS RANKS FOR RUNOFF

(By Andrew Borowiec)

PARIS.—The Socialist-Communist coalition has stepped up its struggle for power in France by deciding to submit joint candidates in next Sunday's final round of elections.

The possibilities of the left-wing forces were shown dramatically in last Sunday's first round: Their popular vote was 46 percent, compared to 38 percent for the Gaullist parties running under the name of the "Union of Republicans for Progress."

As only 59 candidates for the 490-seat National Assembly have been definitely elected, runoffs are needed in the bulk of French electoral districts. The Left's tactic aims at reducing any wasting of votes. The parties will leave in the next round those of their candidates who polled more votes, be they Socialist or Communist, and throw their combined weight to those candidates.

Even if the Gaullist establishment manages to squeak by on March 11th, a united Left wing bloc, intoxicated with success, is likely to become a formidable adversary.

The Gaullists, whether they like it or not, will have to take into account the clamor by the "Popular Front" for change.

The electoral following of the French Left is more preoccupied with immediate issues at home rather than with lofty political ideas on an international scale. Consequently, the Communist and Socialist candidates spoke more about problems as the shortage of telephones, discrepancy in salaries and highway construction rather than about the impact of socialism in the world.

To many French voters the Communists themselves claim they are no longer "the party of the clenched fist but that of the welcoming hand."

Still, few objective Frenchmen care to deny that the "Parti Communiste Francais" is Moscow's right arm in Europe and the main exponent of international communism in this part of the world. This feeling, more than anything else, may yet deprive the united left of its victory.

Strongly helping the Communist cause is the generally constructive record of Communist mayors in scores of cities. These Communist officials have succeeded in running clean administrations, equipping schools with swimming pools and providing satisfactory numbers of kindergartens.

An old rigidity of political orientation was toned down when, in a major development, the party drafted a joint program with Francois Mitterand's Socialists last June—mixture of militant Communism and a more moderate quest for a "Socialist France."

It maps a reform program spaced out five years. The objectives include the nationalization of 13 of the largest French industrial enterprises. This act would not only transform the country's economic structure but would also have serious repercussions in the European Common Market.

Assuming that a Socialist-Communist victory does not bring immediate chaos and economic panic, it nevertheless is more than likely to provoke a major constitutional crisis.

The constitution of the Fifth Republic, drafted by the late Charles de Gaulle, does not provide for a situation in which a president has to name a political foe as his premier.

Georges Pompidou, a confirmed Gaulist, is in the middle of his seven-year mandate. He has said on more than one occasion that he would not talk to Mitterand. Needless to say, he would not even mention the name of the Communists' leader, Georges Marchais. Pompidou has indicated that in the event of a Left-wing victory he would dissolve the newly elected National Assembly and again appeal to the electorate.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE L. ROBINSON

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, when our good friend George L. Robinson retired last year as doorkeeper for the House of Representatives he returned to Colorado with his wife, Ethel, taking with them wonderful memories of their years in Washington. One of the many tributes to George Robinson came from Red Fenwick in the Sunday Denver Post of November 19, 1972. Fenwick has known George for more than 30 years and I would like to share that column with our colleagues:

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE L. ROBINSON

Which way do you spell it—Success or success? I believe too many of us spell it with the dollar signs. But we shouldn't.

I know an Oklahoma farm boy who worked his way up from railroad dining car waiter to confidant of governors, congressmen and many others in influential positions, and who retired last summer a huge success.

His assets weren't too many. Primarily they were—and always have been—a ready and meaningful smile, tons of self-confidence, firm determination and a genuine liking for and respect of others.

His name is George L. Robinson.

As a member of not one but two minorities, George Robinson might be regarded as, "doubly disadvantaged." You might think so, but not my George.

PART BLACK, PART INDIAN

George, was born Jan. 12, 1896, in Dover, Okla., part black, part Cherokee Indian.

Ask about his early education and he'll joke that he was "bused" to school on a pony that carried him to and from school and his dad's farm several miles out of Dover.

George lived like any other farm boy. He did chores in the morning and at night. And he lived on somewhat less than a modest income. That fired him to do better.

The turning point in George's life came when he was working as a dining car waiter for the Union Pacific Railroad. His run was from Chicago to Denver and back.

One night in Denver he attended a political rally and heard a gifted orator declare his philosophies as a human and a politician. The man was the late Ralph Carr, governor of Colorado in the early 1940's.

A few nights later, George decided he'd like to become associated with the man he so deeply admired. So he wrote him a letter.

George suggested that Carr might need a sort of messenger after he was elected governor, and that one George L. Robinson was his man.

He did just that—in competition with several dozen other candidates.

And that was how I met George Robinson 30 years ago come December, when The Denver Post assigned me to cover the Colorado capitol.

The late Bob Steinbruner, Post reporter, introduced us in the governor's office. I was impressed with George's presence, his businesslike handling of all visitors to the governor's office, his friendly smile and engaging handshake.

Actually, George Robinson—in neatly pressed business suit, white starched shirt, necktie and a gleaming shoeshine was more impeccably dressed than Ralph Carr.

To Gov. Carr, and his successor, John Vivian, George became much more than a messenger. He handled appointments for both men, arranged meetings and was asked to give his advice on many matters of state.

When the late Bill Hill was elected to Congress, he took George with him as a clerk in the House of Representatives. A few years later George was promoted to doorkeeper, a position of responsibility he held until his retirement last July.

Allegiance to one political party had nothing to do with Robinson's success: when Democrat Byron Rogers succeeded Republican Bill Hill, Rogers kept George Robinson on his job.

Actually, the first job with the Colorado's governors wasn't his first work in government. He'd been a clerk for the City of Chicago 13 years after serving in World War I. He took the waiter's job because of good pay, but wasn't satisfied that he was doing his best service there.

COLORADO ALWAYS HOME

Strangely, Colorado has always been regarded by George Robinson as home. He lived here three different times, and graduated from high school in Denver—his first love.

When Robinson retired in Washington, congressmen from all parts of the nation stood in the House of Representatives and lauded him as an example of a fine, outstanding, devoted public servant.

It is believed that no other man in George's position ever was so eulogized. Praises came to him from Reps. Wayne Aspinall, Mike McKevitt and Don Brotzman from Colorado; and others from Iowa, Florida, Maryland, Oklahoma, Ohio, New York, Massachusetts, Indiana, and many other states.

The huzzahs continued for two days. George had served 26 years with these men in the House, and they admitted that the "gentleman from Colorado" had helped them as freshmen in the congress and in later years as well.

The Robinsons, George and Ethel, are "at home" now at 3235 Bellaire St., and they've invited friends to visit them.

One of the most fitting comments was made by Rep. Robert Nix, D-Pa., who quoted a short poem by Edward Everett Hale at the end of his remarks:

"I am only one.
"But still I am one.
"I cannot do everything.
"But still I can do something.
"And because I cannot do everything,
"I will not refuse to do the something that I can do."

EVERYDAY LIFE CAN USE LOYALTY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the return of our prisoners of war, many Americans have experienced a renewed understanding of the meaning of loyalty—loyalty to our Nation, our ideals, and ourselves. I would like to share with my House colleagues the following outstanding article by Alice Widener, which appeared in the February 24 San Diego

Union, and know that they, too, will find this commentary thought-provoking.

EVERYDAY LIFE CAN USE LOYALTY

(By Alice Widener)

Capt. James Bond Stockdale, United States Navy, of Coronado, set back into place again the moral code that binds the people of a nation and members of communities and families together.

Speaking on behalf of his fellow prisoners of war, Captain Stockdale told the welcome assembly at Travis Air Force Base, "Thank you for your loyalty to us. We know what loyalty means. We have been living with loyalty, we have been living on loyalty, for the past several years."

There is no finer, more inspiring word than loyalty, meaning faithfulness in allegiance to one's government; faithfulness to a private person to whom fidelity is held to be due; faithfulness to a cause, ideal or custom.

No government and no family can survive without the loyalty of citizens and members. The concept of loyalty is not based on the Utopian notion of a perfect society composed of perfect people. On the contrary, the concept of loyalty—which has triumphed over adversity since the dawn of history—is based on faithfulness to society as it really is and people as they really are with all their defects, virtues and sad mistakes.

The tears that welled into Secretary of State William Rogers' eyes were salty evidence of his own loyalty, as he said that if watching our POWs come home doesn't make America proud, he doesn't know what will.

The angry vibrations in Secretary of State Dean Rusk's voice, six years ago, were evidence of his loyalty as he demanded of a reporter, "Whose side are you on?"

Too much of our intellectual, social, political, and economic life has become bogged down in carping, specious, farfetched or esoteric technicalities and interpretations. Anyone objecting to the twisting of clear meaning is accused by finaglers and twisters as being "simplistic."

For example, no matter what the final verdict in the Ellsberg case, it is plain from Daniel Ellsberg's own first statement to the press about the Pentagon Papers that he expected to go to jail. Furthermore, he said it only after his identity as the revelator was exposed, not by himself but by another.

If Ellsberg had no concept of having done something disloyal by revealing the classified papers entrusted to him, then why did he say at his press conference in Cambridge, Mass., July 1, 1971, that some of the documents were so sensitive he withheld them from the press and instead gave them to Sen. J. William Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

Now what about the draft-dodgers and deserters who fled our country. Obviously, they were not ready to go to jail, no matter what were the subtleties or extremeness of their feelings. They sought a safe haven abroad and received it. Yet, as Secretary Rogers says, "When someone fled or deserted, someone had to take his place."

Quite rightly, President Nixon says that all draft-dodgers and deserters may come home, face the music and pay the price. No decent American would want that price to be cruel or inhumane.

But, as our President and secretary of state say, we should be loyal to the men who were loyal to us and, as Captain Stockdale says, loyal to one another. Had the prisoners not been so, chances are they would not have survived long years of captivity.

Captain Stockdale says he and his fellow prisoners have been living with and on loyalty. If all of us Americans would do so, there is no problem facing our nation we cannot solve in decency, dignity and mutual respect.

OUR NATION SALUTES PAVLICK-KOSTER POST 2640 OF WALLINGTON, N.J., ON THEIR 40TH ANNIVERSARY IN OUTSTANDING DEDICATED SERVICE TO OUR VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AND TO THE COMMUNITY, STATE, AND NATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, last week on invitation from Commander Harry Cannizzaro I was honored and privileged to participate in the 40th anniversary celebration of Pavlick-Koster Post 2640, Veterans of Foreign Wars, whose headquarters are located in my congressional district at Wallington, N.J., and would like to share with you and our colleagues here in the Congress the warmth and history of this organization of veterans who served our country overseas.

As with all accomplishments of inestimable value, nurtured with care, and founded on the friendship, good will and brotherhood of mankind, the Pavlick-Koster Post 2640 grew in stature from a small group of dedicated citizens to one of the most prestigious veterans' organizations in our community, State and Nation. It gives me great pleasure to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress the history of this VFW post as it was so eloquently written in their 40th anniversary celebration program, as follows:

HISTORY OF PAVLICK-KOSTER POST 2640, VFW

It was just 40 years ago that a group of the Borough's leading citizens who had served their country overseas in World War I decided to organize a Veterans of Foreign Wars Unit in Wallington. Through the efforts of 37 dedicated veterans the Post was organized and properly installed on July 23, 1932.

Two of the Borough's war heroes who gave their lives in the defense of our liberty were Stephen Pavlick and Walter Koster, and their memory was immortalized by the choice of Pavlick-Koster as the name of our Post.

The installation was conducted by a Comrade who is no longer with us, former State Commander Henry Giegold.

From July 23rd, 1932 until the end of World War II the Post maintained its headquarters in a meeting room at the Municipal Building, graciously provided for their use by the Borough fathers through the years.

At the conclusion of World War II, hundreds of local overseas veterans, upon their return from service joined with the World War I Veterans still active in the V.F.W. and through combined efforts proceeded to make the Pavlick-Koster Post one of the largest and most active in New Jersey.

By the late 1940's the need for additional meeting room and the feel of growing pains became evident and it was decided that Pavlick-Koster and its Ladies' Auxiliary should build their own home.

With the selection of a building committee made up of members of the Post and Auxiliary, the momentous task of constructing the home of Pavlick-Koster Post 2640 began. In 1951, the cornerstone of our building was laid and during that year we occupied our home.

This realization of owning our own building could not have been possible without the kind and gracious assistance of so many faithful and loyal friends of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

For a number of years our Post ran successfully and grew both in our Community and in the V.F.W.; but this was marred by a fire on Memorial Day 1968. Despite the fire, our Comrades and Sisters participated in the Parade and ceremonies and the kindness of the Firemen of Hose Co. No. 1 who offered the firehouse for our use.

As we tonight celebrate our 40th Birthday we pledge to our community, our citizens and our friends a continuation of dedicated service to our country, our community and our fellow veterans.

Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully request you and our colleagues to join with me also in commendation of the excellence and quality of the leadership of the people who worked so hard over the past four decades in dedicated service to the organization and administration of this VFW post. I know it is impossible to list all of their members throughout the years but in paying tribute to their present officers, past commanders, past presidents of their ladies' auxiliary, charter members, and the deceased members of their post, we can express to all of the Veterans of Foreign Wars our deepest appreciation and heartfelt thanks for a job well done in service to our country. The roster of these VFW officers is as follows:

POST OFFICERS

Harry Cannizzaro, Commander.

John "Ski" Dembowski, Senior Vice Commander.

Robert Skok, Junior Vice Commander.

Edward Puterko, P.C., Quartermaster.

Joseph Bogdan, P.C., Adjutant.

Frank Trestka, Sr., Chaplain.

Frank Rozgony, Officer of the Day.

Frank Rozgony, Chief of Staff.

Robert Shanahan, Sergeant-at-Arms.

John Sakacs, Service Officer.

Joseph Hlavenka, P.C., Assistant Service Officer.

Edward Flejzor, P.C., Assistant Service Officer.

William Giemza, Judge Advocate.

LADIES' AUXILIARY OFFICERS

Mildred Syrek, President.

Maria Dembowski, Senior Vice President.

Frances Kasperski, Junior Vice President.

Helen Hlavenka, Treasurer.

Helen Trotter, Secretary.

Emily Kopec, Chaplain.

Eleanor Tushinsky, Guard.

PAST COMMANDERS

Andrew Dvorschak,* 1932–33.

Andrew Dvorshak,* 1933–34.

Herbert Handel,* 1934–35.

Joseph McQuillan,* 1935–36.

Frank Sharry,* 1936–37.

Thomas Kaczor, Sr.,* 1937–38.

Peter Pavlick, 1938–39.

Frank Davis,* 1939–40.

Cornelius Opthoff, 1940–41.

James Griffith,* 1941–42.

James Griffith,* 1942–43.

Nick Rocco, 1943–44.

Joseph McQuillan,* 1944–45.

Joseph McQuillan,* 1945–46.

John Kraska, 1946–47.

Edward A. Zavatsky, 1947–48.

John Doviak, 1948–49.

Stephen P. Fleyzor, 1949–50.

Paul Cedar, Jr., 1950–51.

James Clark, Jr., 1951–52.

Joseph E. Salko, 1952–53.

John Jaworski, 1953–54.

Edmund Czaikoski, 1954–55.

*Deceased.

Carl Hartmann, Jr., 1955-56.
Emil J. Sondey, 1956-57.
Edward Puterko, 1957-58.
Edward Majewski, 1958-59.
Stephen Plucinsky, 1959-60.
Emil Furtak, 1960-61.
Walter Smagula, 1961-62.
Edward Flejzor, 1962-63.
L. Frank Rusconi, 1963-64.
Joseph Hlavenka, 1964-65.
Eugene Mahalick, 1965-66.
Chester Sembarski, 1966-67.
Joseph Bogdan, 1967-68.
Stanley Syrek, 1968-69.
John Kielbowicz, 1969-70.
Alfred Wojcik, 1970-71.
Alexander Tushinsky, 1971-72.

PAST PRESIDENTS—LADIES' AUXILIARY

Nellie Pavlick, 1933-34.
Margaret Eelman, 1934-35.
Johanna Dvorschak, 1935-36.
Mary Molnar, 1936-37.
Ann Fiola,* 1937-38.
Ida Opthoff, 1938-39.
Nellie G. Stewart, 1939-40.
Mae Sakac, 1940-41.
Ida Opthoff, 1941-42.
Ida Opthoff, 1942-43.
Ida Opthoff, 1943-44.
Lottie Yedlick, 1944-45.
Estelle Handel,* 1945-46.
Nellie Harrigan, 1946-47.
Margaret Lunch, 1947-48.
Anna Antoniuk, 1948-49.
Loretta Neilley, 1949-50.
Julie Klepar, 1950-51.
Helen Pavlick, 1951-52.
Shirley Mahalick, 1952-53.
Violet Kraska, 1953-54.
Doris Mahalick, 1954-55.
Helen Trotter, 1955-56.
Catherine Keller, 1956-57.
Caroline Fleyzor, 1958-59.
Nora Skok, 1958-59.
Laura Onufer, 1959-60.
Marie Zaleski, 1960-61.
Bertha Niemiec, 1961-62.
Rose McCormick, 1962-63.
Mary Pelka, 1963-64.
Mary Skola, 1964-65.
Helen Hlavenka, 1965-66.
Lillian Sukennik, 1966-67.
Adela Buhanick, 1967-68.
Leona DeCaro, 1968-69.
Lois McKeeby, 1969-70.
Fran Davis, 1970-71.
Anna Maciag, 1971-72.

VFW CHARTER MEMBERS

Thomas Baker.*
Peter Barscewski.*
David Conley.
Cornelius De Groot.*
Hedley Dreher.*
Andrew Dvorschack.*
William Eilman.
Emil Fenska.*
Philip Fiola.*
Daniel Freeland.*
Christian Gennehen.
Jacob Gustina.*
Jerbert Handel.*
Joseph Hicswa.
Konstanty Himilik.
Thomas Kaczor.*
Theodore Kozlowski.*
Michael Kapuscinski.*
Joseph Kempinski.
John Lesko.*
Stephen McCabe.*
John Macik.
Julian Miceszewski.*
John Molnar.*
Peter Pavlick.
Morris Rothenberg.*
John Sakac.
Frank Sharry.*
Jacob DeKoyer.
George Shelepets.*
Albert Shufnara.
Joseph Sroko.*
William Stewart.
Andrew Sudeck.
Joseph Sura.*
Cornelius Wagner.
Joseph Zyska.

LADIES' AUXILIARY CHARTER MEMBERS

Olga Bobitz.
Anna Budzyko.
Mae Preher.
Minnie DeKoyer.*
Johanna Dvorschak.
Margaret Eilman.
Anna Fenska.
Anna Fiola.
Frances Genneken.
Mary Jacoby.
Marie Kaczor.
Caroline Kapushinski.
Mary Molnar.
Nellie Pavlick.
Helen Pavlick.
Veronica Sakac.*
Anna Shelepets.
Mary Shufnara.
Bertha Sossel.
Anna Sroka.
Anna Sudeck.
Mae Sudeck.
Mary Wagash.
Lottie Yedlick.

IN MEMORY OF DEPARTED MEMBERS OF OUR POST

Stephen Pavlick.
Walter Koster.
Michael Kapicinski.
Paul Westdyke.
Max Weiner.
Frank Davis.
George Shelepets.
Emil Galka.
James Griffith.
John Braviak.
Theodore Sydlensky.
Thomas Baker.
Cornelius DeGroot.
Louis Molnar.
Stanley Lanucha.
John Juritsko.
John Koshlap.
Stanley Weglarz.
Edward Zanowitz.
Joseph McQuillan.
Dr. John J. Hirsch.
Frank Rochrich, Jr.
Victor Gentilelip.
Frank Potocki.
Walter Nicradka.
Anthony Butchko.
John Lesko, Sr.
Geroge Wallace.
Henry Markuart.
Edward Pulaski.
Andrew Dvorschak.
Frank Keller.
Miller Jackson.
Harold Green.
Paul Kosior.
Peter Barshewsky.
Frank Sharry.
Michael Ridosh.
John Van Der Ploeg.
John Chisick.
Walter Lugowski.
Col. Anthony Tencza.
John Molnar.
Andrew Lantka.
Albert Danyo.
Arthur Melito.
Arthur Fitzpatrick.
Ivan Davidowski.
Stanley Oko.
Herbert Handel.
William Nowicki.
Thomas Kaczor, Sr.
Edward Scheiblin.
Morris Rothenberg.
Basil Hrobak.
Frederick Surdyka.
Peter Pavlick.
Henry Maciag.
Bruno Stolarz.
Joseph Dorner.
Al Adamo.
William Kullaf.
Michael Pastor.
Joseph Onufer.
Stephen McCabe.
John Banas.
Peter Dishuk.
Adam Sokol.
Rudy Kasni.
Frank Sherman.
John Kmetz.
Daniel Vreeland.
John Klevitt, Sr.
Andrew Czajko.
Theodore Vanecek.
Joseph Wojtowicz.
Leo Swaja.
Peter J. McCallum.
Edward Geryak.
Chester Kowal.
Edward Kobylarz.
Alexander Rusieski.
S-4th Richard E. Cyran.
Edward Cheslock.
Edward Smagula.
Stanley Wiesniewski.
Robert Kempster.
Joseph Sura.
John Bednarczyk.
John Vasilyk.
Ben Latawiec.
John Casey.
Ted Latawiec.
William Barnowski.
Walter Gusciora.
Charles Kaczyk, Jr.
John Bobko.
Thaddeus Grosiak.
Edwin Sobala.
Alexander Bednarz.
George Durisko.
Jacob Gustina.
John Derkacs.
Michael Mullic.
John L. Durofsin.
Stanley M. Sudol.
John Kochan (Jr. Vice Cmdr.).
Richard Fritz.
Stanley Grosiak.
John Dondzil.
Henry Palatini.
Michael Tackach.
Nicholas Koske.
John W. Affourtit.
James E. Jones.
John Maciag.
William McDonald.
Daniel DeVries.
Samuel Shekitka.
Stanley Gorgol.
John Buyanowitz.
John Dyr.
Joseph Scangarella.
Jacob DeKoyer.
Joseph Sondey.
Leo Furmanek.
Walter Hmielowiec.
Bill Dziuba.
Joseph Hudak.
Michael Bartman.
Joseph Puglia.
Haze Anderson.
Edward Zak.
Chester Dombrowski.
Konstanty Hemilik.
Walter Gudaszewski.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate this opportunity and wish to express my sincere thanks to you and our colleagues for joining with me today in saluting the Pavlick-Koster Post 2640, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and ladies' auxiliary, Wallington, N.J., in commemoration of their 40th anniversary in outstanding public service to our people.

---

* Deceased.

PUBLIC COMMENTS BY NAVY CAPTAIN DENTON

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, Americans will long remember the words "God Bless America" as spoken by Navy Capt. Jeremiah A. Denton, Jr., immediately upon his arrival at a U.S. base in the Philippines after he had survived more than 7 years of imprisonment by the Communists in Southeast Asia.

Captain Denton in the meanwhile has proceeded to the naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va., where he is receiving medical examinations and on Feb. 23, 1972, he commented publicly in response to published suggestions he had been coached on what he chose to say in his arrival statement. His comments in that regard are contained within the following paragraphs which are the final three paragraphs in a story of more than 40 paragraphs as printed in the Washington Post, February 24:

Denton said that "one sour note in our homecoming was sounded" however, in an article written by Robert Maynard, ombudsman for the *Washington Post*, that appeared in the Post on Wednesday. It was reprinted in today's Norfolk Virginian-Pilot.

Maynard suggested that the homecoming had been orchestrated by the government, "a militarily managed event down to the last 'God Bless America.' "

Denton said that if Maynard "meant, entirely meant, what he said . . . I'm sorry for him and pray he will come off it. As one of my sons used to say, 'Open up your heart and let the sunshine in.' Most Americans, from what we've read in the press and what we got in personal letters and telegrams to us, see some sunshine now and we certainly see a lot of it. And I'm asking Mr. Maynard to come out and enjoy it."

Although I have not seen a complete transcript of them, much more of Captain Denton's February 23 comments did appear elsewhere in the Washington Post in a separate story.

Mr. Speaker, I find much of value in what the captain had to say and I believe other Members will also. Therefore, I ask that the separate story appear at this point in the RECORD. It is a story composed almost entirely of words spoken eloquently and with obvious sincerity by Captain Denton.

CAPTAIN DENTON'S COMMENTS

(By Donald P. Baker)

PORTSMOUTH, VA., February 23.—Navy Capt. Jeremiah A. Denton Jr., the first American prisoner of war to set foot in the United States as part of the Vietnam ceasefire agreement, may be among the last actually to reach his residence.

Denton, the father of seven, lives in Virginia Beach, just a half-hour's drive from the Portsmouth Naval Hospital, where he is being de-briefed and getting medical examination after more than seven years in captivity.

At a press conference here today, Denton talked about easing back into American society, and of some impressions he has of the United States in 1973.

"Life on the 12th deck (floor) is very close to Heaven," he said, "They're going to have to evict me to get rid of me."

He said he met Miss America today and hopes to drive around town Saturday. "I mention this because, in all good will, people seem to read things into the most trivial acts or unacts that we perform or don't perform."

He said that "with respect to the slowness with which some of us, especially I, might want to return to everything, let me remind you that returning and establishing rapport again with a wife and seven children, each one of whom is quite different and each one of whom is being all-important to me, is not something that's to be done in one hour or one day.

"I'm still doing that, and it's the most delicious experience of my life," he said as his wife, Jane, sitting nearby, beamed.

"In my opinion, the best way for that process to start is in the privacy of the little haven we have on the 12th deck, and I've been grateful to the planners that they anticipated that some of us might feel that way.

"My priorities right now are the debriefing; we have a lot to report on. It's a long time and there are a good many events.

"The physical and mental checkups that we're undergoing now to get us back up to speed let us know where we're lacking and fix it; to establish a rapport with my immediate family, my wife and my children now, my mother and my brother perhaps in a week or so, other friends, local friends, and then I'd like to go back to my birthplace in Mobile and re-establish connections with dear friends we have down there."

Denton also described a dream house that he pictured in his dreams during his years in the prisoner-of-war camp.

"I like to fish and I like the water. I'd like to live on the water and I have dreamed up a place, not an extravagant place, located on a bay which I hope is still as pure as it was, and perhaps relatively unpopulated, between Pensacola and Mobile. A place called Perdido Bay. And some day, not necessarily next year, but some day, I'd like to live there."

Denton said he hopes the return of the prisoners will "strike a chord" with the American people. "An awareness that some chord somehow has just been sounded . . . to be used by God to help us find an awareness and fundamentals which we may have somewhat blurred in the past few years here at home.

"I believe I can speak for all in saying that we want to be used that way . . . the perspective in which I see this experience we're now sharing (is) an exposure of the fact that human nature, when placed under duress, can find and use sources of strength necessary not only to survive, but to do creditably. That's really what happened and you all see it.

"Although we are the greatest (nation) in history and still have the greatest spirit in history, I believe that like other great nations in history, we may be in a period in which human nature is being subjected to a lack of physical duress, if you will.

"That long ago, we have achieved the necessities and we have been in the process of attaining a great degree of luxury, degrees of luxury which distract us some, and we are concerned with such matters as wrap-around octophonic sound in our automobiles and so forth. We are becoming quite sophisticated with respect to non-necessities.

"This has happened to nations in the past, and it is my belief that man can cope with adversity, and that his most difficult problem is coping with prosperity.

"I believe further, however, that man is capable, even in prosperity, even in an animal sort of prosperity where he has everything he has physically, I believe he is capable of reaching down into the better parts of his nature or, if you will, in communicating with God, if you happen to believe in God, to find thoughts, to find goals which will keep him from falling into the historic trap of going over the wrong end of that power curve that comes in the rise and fall of nations. . . ."

RULES FOR REVOLUTION

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is some pretty careless talk about what might happen if some people do not get their way on funding of certain programs.

Some of this is nothing less than deliberate incitation to riot on the part of others. It is the "let's you and him fight" mentality. The following editorial from the February 23, 1973, Indianapolis Star dissects this dangerous and irresponsible ploy:

RULES FOR REVOLUTION

Deputy Mayor Edward K. Hamilton of New York said in Congress the other day that cutting Federal welfare outlays might trigger new Watts-type riots in American cities.

He was playing a dangerous game that has grown all too familiar in the last eight years.

Much of the national welfare outlay is sheer waste which does not help the poor but keeps them poor. Congressional reports show that programs discourage incentive and are loaded with graft, expensive bureaucratic incompetence and fraud. Senate investigations have found that up to 45 per cent of recipients on welfare roles in the District of Columbia were ineligible.

New York City is the biggest, worst welfare offender in the country. Under Mayor John V. Lindsay its budget has leaped from $3 billion to more than $8 billion a year. More than $2 billion goes for welfare. One out of eight New Yorkers is on relief.

The reported chiseling and inefficiency are incredible. Literally hundreds of millions of dollars a year are said to go down the drain for fraudulent health care claims and relief grants. The system encourages illegitimacy. Aid to families with dependent children recipients rose from 566,500 in 1965 to more than 1.275 million in 1971 in New York State, while total annual welfare outlays during the same period jumped from $644.7 million to more than $3.5 billion, New York City accounting for most of the increase.

Much of the waste goes into quartering of relief recipients in hotels and motels at costs ranging to more than $50,000 a family a year. Much goes into lobbying for bigger outlays and radical agitation activities.

New York's welfare-radical activism, like that in other urban centers, follows with modifications a pattern of "guerrilla" organization outlined in the mid-1960s by the late Saul Alinsky in his book, "Rules for Revolution." The central idea is simple: "Threats get you what you want from the government."

The tactics call for organizing minorities into power blocs and through radical agitation fanning complaints into critical, emotion-charged "issues." When this carefully planned and orchestrated tension erupts into rioting, the violence is described as "spontaneous" and the intense shock is exploited by the organizers to drum huge floods of money out of Congress and the appropriate government agencies.

As everyone who has dug very deeply into "poverty" programs knows, a large proportion of the "poverty" billions winds up in the hands of bureaucrats running the programs and shrewd operators who make a racket out of pretending to help the poor. Critics of this callous exploitation are called "racists," "bigots" and "reactionaries."

The Watts riot, far from being spontaneous, followed a long and systematic program of agitation climaxed by an almost Nazi-like mass rally at the Will Rogers Auditorium on Aug. 7, 1965. Just four days later began the rioting which caused 34 deaths, more than 1,000 injuries and millions of dollars' damage. The Watts pattern of agitation subsequently helped fan civil disturbances all across the nation.

If poor Americans are to get genuine governmental help, they should get the kind of help that will enable them to break out of the cycle of dependency, which will require a massive overhaul of the exploitive politically motivated welfare system.

Efforts to perpetuate the existing corrupt, futile and wasteful system through a combination of threats and self-fulfilling prophecies of violence can lead only to trouble and tragedy.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my colleagues daily of the plight of our prisoners of war. Now, for most of us, the war is over. Yet despite the cease-fire agreement's provisions for the release of all prisoners, fewer than 600 of the more than 1,900 men who were lost while on active duty in Southeast Asia have been identified by the enemy as alive and captive. The remaining 1,220 men are still missing in action.

A child asks: "Where is Daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife wonders: "Is my husband alive or dead?" How long?

Until those men are accounted for, their families will continue to undergo the special suffering reserved for the relatives of those who simply disappear without a trace, the living lost, the dead with graves unmarked. For their families, peace brings no respite from frustration, anxiety, and uncertainty. Some can look forward to a whole lifetime shadowed by grief.

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and their families, we can at least pay that minimum. Until I am satisfied, therefore, that we are meeting our obligation, I will continue to ask, "How long?"

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, March 12, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation and uphold me with Thy free spirit.—Psalms 51: 12.

Our Heavenly Father, the source of all that is good in life and the companion of our pilgrim way, we come again to Thee seeking guidance and wisdom as we face the duties of this day. By Thy grace may we master our difficulties with courage, manage our responsibilities with fidelity, and meet all of life with the spirit of good will. Help us to live with the lift of love in our hearts that life may be better and brighter for us and for all men.

Bless our country and these leaders of our beloved Republic. Give wisdom to our President, our Speaker, and these representatives of a free people that together their influence may be used for the welfare of our Nation and for the well-being of all mankind.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 8, 1973, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

APPRECIATION EXPRESSED TO THE BOTANIC GARDEN

(Mr. HALEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, last week a young man named Allan Dickerson who works at the Botanic Garden delivered to my office a genuine Florida orange tree bearing both blossoms and oranges—a sight seen only by fellow Floridians, tourists of the Sunshine State, or residents of the other States which I understand grow limited amounts of citrus. The young man said that we had turned the tree over to the Botanic Garden to care for and that they thought our office staff might enjoy having the tree to look at in full bloom. My office staff were a little puzzled since they did not remember giving the tree to the garden in the first place. Then we looked at the tag on the tree which read, "Haley, Room 1205." Mr. Speaker, we have not occupied that room in over 8 years. I think you will agree with me that Botanic Garden personnel not only have green thumbs but also elephant's memories.

Since the garden was founded in 1820 it has been a source of education and pleasure for many. Each spring the handiwork of Botanic Garden employees are evidenced in the beautiful flowers which brighten Capitol Hill. I am sure that we will all agree that our congressional offices are far more appealing places for both our staffs and constituents because of the many plants grown for and provided to us by the garden. I would like to just extend my appreciation to the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. White, and his assistant, Mr. Jim Crow, for their fine work in making the Botanic Garden a source of enjoyment for us all.

RECONSTRUCTION OF NORTH AND SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. BURTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been troubled by the reaction of some of our colleagues to the proposal of President Nixon that the Congress at some point support his recommendation to provide funds for the reconstruction of Vietnam, the north as well as the south.

Some of our colleagues, I fear, are succumbing to the temptation of extending our grave differences with the President on domestic policy and the lack of adequate funding for those programs by linking the full funding of domestic programs with this proposal for the reconstruction of Vietnam.

I would submit particularly for all of us who opposed our involvement in the war and who urged its conclusion that it is little enough, by way of American treasure, to spend on the reconstruction of Vietnam, north and south, particularly when we put it into the context that the amounts proposed are a good deal less than any 1- or 2-month extension of this war would have cost the National Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the suggestion of the administration in its final form, but it is my strongest predisposition to support the administration in this effort, because I shudder to think what options would have been available to us if that miserable war would have gone on for months and months, or perhaps even years and years longer.

HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

(Mr. FAUNTROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 11, 1973, was a historic day for it marked the first time in 11 years that this Capital City was privileged to see its area public and parochial high school basketball champions engage in friendly, earnest, and able competition. To mark the renewal of the event our distinguished colleague from Maryland offered me a friendly wager on the game, he optioning for the parochial high school champ, DeMatha, and I for the inter-high school champion, Western. Being a Baptist clergyman and not a betting man, I could not take him up on the offer but did agree that should my team lose I would pay tribute to the victor with a floor speech and presentation of a U.S. flag that has been flown over the U.S.